

THE
CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. IX.

JANUARY, 1857.

No. 4.

ART. I.—DISSENSIONS IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE, AND THEIR
FINAL ADJUSTMENT.—No. I.

THAT brilliant but eccentric gentleman, Mr. Walter Savage Landor, suggested, some years since, the formation of a gallery to be filled with the likenesses of the great heroes of England, in the sphere of public life, of Literature, of the Drama, of Philosophy, of Natural Science, of the Arts, and of mechanical inventions. But from this Valhalla he proposed to exclude the great Theologians, on the ground that their works were chiefly controversial, having been called into Life through the exigencies of party warfare. It never seemed to have occurred to Mr. Landor, that all great achievements, all glorious unfoldings of Truth, are in some sort the product of conflict; are, in themselves, battles against existing falsehoods in the world of thought or belief. A Raphael, indeed, may be painting his cartoons and dreaming of the beautiful forms soon to be the delight of a world, while Titans are engaged in a war to end in the spiritual emancipation of men: a Goethe, to his shame, may have a song for every theme, save the Father-land, writhing in agony under the oppressor. Art moves in its own way and scarcely feels the common pulsations of the human heart. Its waters do not mingle with the common stream of History; they are fountains by the way side. Its Light shines and blazes apart, noticeable and grand, yet withal a Law unto itself. But the heroes of the race are they who fight its battles, and their thoughts are not so much of beauty, as of Truth, of righteousness, and of God. No great

right has been secured, no great blessing conferred, no great work done without toil, and weariness, and fight. The course of Empire, the growth of thought, the advance of knowledge—our revolutions, and our reformatations, our very firesides are all, in some form or other, the prize and guerdon of battle. Battle is thus a potent factor in all History. By battle the world moves on. The causes and the men alike who occasion and produce it, do not challenge our admiration; on the contrary, they are condemned to infamy—bringing to light the worst aspects of human nature and its radical defect of sin. The Hero and deliverer comes after the Oppressor; and oppression must needs be sharp before his work can come to successful issues. So, also, the lover of Truth battles against error and falsehood. It is in resistance against wrong that the true hero reveals his qualities. The knight errant, on the other hand, armed cap-a-pie, going forth in quest of foes, is a mere fantastic being; and the keen dialectician, who challenges a world to dispute his Theses, is a mere knight errant. War having its origin, then, in wrongs done, in falsehoods spoken, in oppressions committed, is scarcely an amusement to the man who undertakes it. The undertaking is the sacrifice of personal ease, for truth and right against the wrong. It is a great mistake to suppose that the true hero seeks battle for the sake of battle. It is sheer necessity that compels him. It is well to bear this in mind in all our studies of History, and in our estimates of the men who occupy conspicuous places upon its pages.

These observations apply as well to the Christian religion and Church, as to the State and the Social life of man. From the time that Christianity first made its appearance among men, down to the present day, conflict has been one of the great elements of its Life and History. We may be weary of it, nevertheless against our will we are perpetually in the midst of it. We congratulate ourselves when one ugly issue is disposed of, still we are soon compelled to awaken to the realities of another. When the noise of strife is ringing in our ears, it pleases us to dream of times when warfare, within the Church, was unknown. Who has not heard Clergymen, while deploring our modern contentions, wax warm in their descriptions of the Primitive Age, and set it forth in glowing terms as free from the presence of party spirit? Is it not an old story to say of the Apostolic Age—*then* dissensions were unknown? Even Hegesippus, living in the second century, discourses of the matter like a nineteenth century clergyman.* Nor need

* Euseb. Hist. Bk. 3: c. 32.

this surprise us, since, even before his day, it was gravely said, that the Apostles were, before they were called by our Lord, "sinners above the rest of mankind."* The common notion upon this subject, it seems to us is, that the Church, in the Apostolic Age, suffered only from without—that Jew and Gentile sought, each in his own way, to crush her young life, while within the pale, holiness, love, and peace, held undisputed sway. We pronounce this, at the outset, a fiction. And we propose to set forth, in brief review, the truth of the matter, in the hope that the lessons to be gathered from the party dissensions in the Apostolic Age and their final adjustment, may not be lost upon us at this late hour of the world.

The wide-spread misconception of the actual condition of the primitive Apostolic Church, may be readily accounted for. It springs, we should say, from the knowledge that the Apostles themselves, guided and inspired by the Holy Ghost, were the teachers and pastors of the Church. It flows by way of inference from this fact. No motive has been present to the immense majority of men to start a question, or to raise a doubt respecting the extent of the influence wielded by the Apostles themselves. Then still farther, as part and parcel of the general notion, has been that firm perception upon the part of modern Christians, of the enormous, startling, *moral force*, which Christianity possessed and displayed in this period. Here are two facts, both of great significance in themselves, and certainly well fitted to lead men, without further thought, to the opinion, that this was the true *Paradisaic Period* of Christian History. This morning twilight rosy with Auroral splendors, embosomed in an atmosphere of divine love, is the point which has ever awakened the keenest delight and sympathy of Christian hearts. We find it a source of joy, not, however, because we suppose the Church then to have been what many fancy it, but because, amid storm and darkness, threatened from within, as well as persecuted from without, she held on her course freighted with truths and powers for the healing of the nations. As we read the history of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Age, it is not simply the divine supernatural revelation of redemptive grace and blessing, finding its way to benighted hearts with softest, gentlest tread, but it is a hand to hand conflict between the Spirit of God and the human soul, between truth and falsehood within men, between love and selfishness, and the final triumph of grace over nature. How can we ever lose sight of this fact? How can we sup-

* Barnabas Epistolae V, p. 9, Ed. Hefeb.

pose that God's truth, should, in that age of awful wickedness, have so triumphed over men's perversity as to have changed at once all individual peculiarities and to have converted every member of the Church into a noble saint—the very mirror of self-sacrifice and of charity? Christianity, though in itself the highest miracle *always*, is, nevertheless, in so far forth natural that it acts and has ever acted upon men according to their individual characteristics and peculiarities. Aye, through these, it has always addressed itself in manifold forms to the world. It converts the differences of temperament and of individual gifts into harmonious instrumentalities of good. The body of Christ, viewed as composed of “many members,” is an organism embracing every type of human talent. When the Gospel of Christ gains possession of an individual, it does not forthwith blot out his personal traits, but leaves room for their display, and supplies motives for their noblest exercise. Being a moral, spiritual discipline, it wages warfare against the evil within him, while, in the modes of that warfare, as also in its results, the individuality of the believer is both preserved and developed. As now the power of Christian truth over an individual varies in the different periods of his own life, so, also, does it vary among individuals themselves. Its hold over myriads is feeble enough, while it comes in the fullness of blessing as light and strength to others. It has now, and it always has had, to contend with untold obstacles within the soul—with its old habits of sin, with its ignorance, in a word, with all its defects. Nor was the Apostolic Age, in any sense, an exception to this principle. By a reference, therefore, to the ingredients of which the Christian Communion was at first composed, it will be seen that internal conflict was inevitable, and, more than this, its character will be brought to light.

It is of course known to every one that the Ministry of the Lord Jesus was confined to the “lost sheep of the House of Israel.” It is equally known to every reader of the New Testament, that the Apostles, as disciples or attendants upon the Lord in His Earthly Ministry, hoped for a “restoration of the kingdom unto Israel” in a carnal sense, quite at variance with the real objects of His Advent. The Resurrection may be said to have called Historic Christianity into life, while the Pentecostal gift was the inauguration of its divine power. Apostolic labor however was at first limited to the Jews, and to the last in fact, the original twelve were, in a special sense, the “Apostles of the Circumcision.” True, tradition connects St. Peter's name with the Church and City of Rome, and Ephesus was beyond doubt the sphere of the latest labors of St. John, never-

theless even these are with the others commonly spoken of as ministers of (i. e. for) the Circumcision. At first, then, Christianity moved upon the soil of Judaism, and this not in any sense accidentally, but by divine appointment. Teachers and taught, Apostles and brethren alike were among the circumcised who had no thought of forsaking "the commandments and ordinances." They believed in the risen Jesus as the promised Messiah, nevertheless they remained firmly attached to the Law. They were not at this early date called upon to discuss the relation of the Law to the Gospel. They had no motive to advance beyond the exigencies of the moment. Their faith in Christ did not require them to break away from the observances to which they had been accustomed. Peter and John are seen going towards the Temple at the hour of prayer. All this is perhaps more important for a proper appreciation of the Church's posture at the outset of her course, than many persons suppose. Let it be borne in mind that the Jew believed in the divine origin and authority of the Law. In the Law and Prophets, in Holy Writ he found the promise of a Messiah to come. It was part of the covenant that Christ should come of the seed of Abraham. Consequently they who heard and received the witness of the Apostles respecting Jesus and His Messiahship could not be supposed to enter at once into the inexhaustible fullness and breadth of the redemptive blessing, nor foresee the unfoldings of the truth and the form of Christian life to be developed in the future. No great idea or law is ever grasped at once in all the fruitful and manifold ends to which it may lead. The faith in Christ was a present concrete fact, and became a law of life to those Jewish believers as Jews. They were not forsaking but realizing the covenant in their allegiance to Jesus. The Temple still stood; the Priesthood still offered sacrifices; the brethren repaired thither as of old, though its courts might be thronged with multitudes who rejected Jesus as the Messiah. Under its Jewish form the gospel spread. Thousands, not merely in Jerusalem but elsewhere, were received into the "company of the faithful." A great company of the priests even became obedient unto the faith. Apostles and brethren went forth preaching Jesus, and declaring that by Him, God would judge the world. They preached Him as the One Saviour—they set forth a truth which was itself, as we, *after* the event read it, a proclamation that the Law had passed away. Yet this fact does not appear to have presented itself to their minds as a definite, tangible reality. Even the Apostle Peter, although by his baptism of Cornelius he took the initiative in the admission of uncircumcised Gentiles into the Church, found

it necessary to explain the transaction to the brethren in Jerusalem. (Acts xi, 2, 3 seq.) So jealous were some at least at that time of anything like fraternization with the uncircumcised. More than this, St. Peter did not seem to regard the vision at Joppa and the baptism at Cæsarea as an intimation to go forth specifically beyond the Jews, in his labors. We may naturally conclude that the Jerusalem Church as such, certainly an influential party in it, still viewed the Law as in force, although they had as yet framed no theory respecting the universality of its claims. The "Gentile question" had not yet "come up." In differing degrees of zeal they were wedded to the Law, and at the same time rejoiced in Christ as their Saviour. They were Jewish Christians, or Christian Jews. Such was their position.

Still our picture has its dark side; Jewish bigotry has its place in this History. With great flippancy men are accustomed to speak of the Jews of our Saviour's day as bigots—that is, as men governed by a violent unreasoning attachment to their traditions, and ready to persecute to the death, when and where they had the power, any and all persons who might question the truth of them. And with this thought the luckless Jew is dismissed. But do we consider sufficiently the full effect of this bigotry upon the character of the Jew? We do not hesitate to affirm that it blinded his perceptions of right and wrong. He judged men, not in righteousness, but in their relation simply to his own notions and traditions. He would wink at violations of Divine Law, provided the offender paid tithes of mint, anise and cummin. The Lord pronounced His severest denunciations against the very party most noted for the strictness with which it adhered to all the niceties of ceremonial purity. He accused them of compassing sea and land to make one proselyte, and declared that when they succeeded, they made him tenfold more the child of hell than themselves. When through their machinations the person of the Redeemer was secured and brought before the governor, they themselves would not enter within the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled, and so, disqualified to keep the feast; they therefore stood without, shouting Crucify Him! Crucify Him! These Jews would commit adultery themselves, though they were ready to stone man or woman caught in the act; they would steal, though they taught others not to steal; they would abhor idolatry, though they would not scruple to take and appropriate the votive offerings in the temples of idols. The name of God, says the inspired penman with hot indignation, was blasphemed among the Gentiles through them. Thus they were

thoroughly wicked and unscrupulous in life, all the while pluming themselves upon their holiness, and counting presumptuously upon the favor of Heaven, because they were of the seed of Abraham. Josephus himself, whose moral qualities, if we may credit De Quincey, were of the most questionable character, avows his belief that the Earth would have opened her mouth and swallowed up Jerusalem, had not the wrath of God in the shape of a Roman army swept it away. Such is the bigot always, dead in heart and conscience, without humanity, ready to employ deceit and every vile instrument within his reach to accomplish his ends, preferring work in the dark to sunshine, stripped of kindness, blind to the merits of his opponents whom he makes if possible his victims. The bigot rests his hopes of salvation always upon particulars which have nothing to do with his moral life, which do not interfere with his selfishness or lust, come in what form soever it may. His hatred of free, manly thought is equaled only by his hatred of the thinker. A Philip of Spain, in his zeal for the glory of God, does not scruple to plan with "diabolical sagacity" the desolation of the Netherlands,—to blot from the book of the living, an entire people, rather than suffer it to be prosperous in what *he* dared name its heresy—he the while, wicked and base as the basest of his minions, in his own life. The venom of bigotry often slumbers, because its subjects are often insignificant, but when aroused it is fierce, hateful, and false to the core. God pity us when we find it necessary to apologize for it on the score of its sincerity. Now Judaism was fallen into almost universal moral death and bigotry. With a sort of insane fierceness it adhered amid its utter demoralization and estrangement from God, to the letter of the Law. Ruin and the abyss were before it, men were wild with conflicting ideas, and some were taking the kingdom of Heaven by violence. The moral atmosphere in which the Jew, who was called now to choose or reject Christ Jesus, was born and nurtured, was bad in itself and unfavorable in many respects even in the event of his transition to the Church. Not all were Apostles; not all who accepted Jesus as the Messiah were partakers of His Spirit. As the little band which followed the Lord Jesus in His earthly course had its Judas, so the Church had not only its false brethren, but others likewise whose views of the work of Christ were limited entirely to the seed of Abraham "according to the flesh." They could not slough their Jewish skin nor rise above the level of their Jewish prejudices. They were the men who

clamored against the conduct of St. Peter in the matter of Cornelius. We fancy that the thought of preaching Jesus as an object of Faith to the uncircumcised was something that did not occur to them, or if it did, it was sure to meet with their unqualified hostility. They looked for the spread of the Gospel only through the Law. This was their first thought, devotion to it their deepest spring of action. While matters hung in suspense, or before the agitation of the relation of the Law to the Gospel, they were not noticeable for any dangerous traits of character—but when the crisis came they displayed the fierce bigotry of their nation, and their Christianity was submerged beneath their Judaism.

It is necessary now to notice how and by whom the crisis came. In the moment of CHRIST's first appearance to Saul, on his way to Damascus, He revealed to him his field of ministerial labor. It was his special work to carry the Gospel of salvation to the Gentiles. In the execution of his mission he went from city to city preaching Christ as the Son of God, through whom men were justified by faith without the works of the Law. This was the universal truth and gospel for the nations who were without God in the world, and were strangers to the Covenants of Promise. It was Paul's work to lift the Gospel "clear over" all the barriers of Judaism, and to preach the faith of Christ to all men, irrespective of blood, kindredship, or tongue. Here was a grand Catholic principle, that by the Cross of CHRIST *God* was creating from the two divisions of the world—Jewish and Gentile—one new spiritual body. In fact, St. Paul himself personally seems to have felt this as a great mystery, i. e. Revelation. The Epistle to the Ephesians, written late in his life, fully shows how deeply he was impressed not only with the grandeur, but with the *newness* of this truth. He declares it to have been the mystery hidden from the past ages of the world, but now made known through the Apostles. It was a truth quite at war with the world's thought—so much at war with the ordinary ideas of mankind, as not to have been *evolved* from his own mind in the way of logical deduction or ratiocination from admitted principles. On the contrary, it was a Revelation—it was beyond and above the reach of human thought as such. And this truth seized his innermost being. Christ appeared to him as the central bond and power to hold mankind together, and faith in Him whereby we are justified was the Catholic Gospel which he was sent to proclaim to the uncircumcised world, come what might in the shape of opposition from any or from all who were still in bondage to Jewish prejudice. Now it must be obvious that this great idea, this

new mystery or Revelation, which he announced as a mystery, this new doctrine that man is justified without the works of the Law, would sooner or later bring the Apostle of the Gentiles directly to the question of the relation of the Law to the Gospel. For Gentile Churches were multiplying alike in number and power, and what were they to do in the matter of the Law? In what light did it become them to regard it? Were its provisions in whole or in part, binding upon them or not? This was the inevitable question grounded in and caused by the very gospel which Paul preached and which they received. And to this question we have a full and satisfactory answer in the Apostle's own writings. What he had preached, that he also wrote. His doctrine was one and the same everywhere, whether by word of mouth or by written composition. We plant ourselves in this matter, especially upon the Epistle to the Galatians, written, perhaps, during the stormiest and most trying period of his life. The object of this Epistle is not to set forth the doctrine of justification by faith. The spirit of this doctrine, indeed, everywhere pervades it, but next to the vindication of his own apostleship, St. Paul devotes himself fully to the development of this theme—the relation of the Law to the Gospel. To this end, he goes back to a period antecedent to the promulgation of the law, to the days of the patriarch Abraham. Abraham believed God, and this was counted to him for righteousness. The possession of Abraham's faith entitles a man, and this alone, to the claim of sonship to Abraham. Because God would justify the Heathen by faith, He communicated the glad tidings before hand—"in thee shall all the nations be blessed." This was the promise, "in thy seed," which is, adds St. Paul, Christ. This was the glorious Covenant which the Law given 430 years afterwards could not annul. Christ then was the fulfillment of the promise. He became a curse in order that the blessing enjoyed by Abraham might be extended to the Gentiles, not through circumcision, but through that faith by which Abraham himself was justified "while in uncircumcision."

Hence the question, What of the Law? Is it the overthrow, the annulment of the promise of God made before its promulgation? God forbid. Now while allowing it to be of divine origin, the Apostle nevertheless sets it forth as a temporary, provisional institution. It was added because of transgressions "*until the seed should come to whom the promise was made.*" It was simply our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. Christ however having come, the functions of the schoolmaster cease; the Law as such and its necessity alike disappear. The princi-

ple is illustrated by the example of an heir during his minority. He differs in nothing from a servant, notwithstanding his suzerainty, but is placed under governors and tutors until the time appointed by his father is completed. "So we," adds the Apostle, "when we were children were held in bondage," under the elements of the world, i. e., we were instructed in the rudiments and elementary principles of religion. "But when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law that He might redeem them that are under the law, that we might receive the adoption"—and so enjoy the inheritance. The Law then having served its purpose was henceforth dead by the fiat of God. Its claims had ceased. The Gentiles had nothing to do with it. To submit to circumcision on the ground of its necessity to salvation was to fall from grace. The Apostle however does even more than state in this style the relation of the Law to the Gospel. He penetrates into the inner characteristics and properties of law. "If indeed a law had been given which was able to make alive, then verily righteousness (i. e., justification) would have been by law." This was a work however beyond its reach. Elsewhere he shows how true this is. The Law was the strength of sin; it brought to light man's knowledge of sin, but it could not confer righteousness, nor secure for the soul its lasting peace. It could not turn the current of a sinful temper. In fact, it increased sin, though in itself holy, just, and good. By it sin took occasion and deceived men and put them to a moral death. Under law the world could but feel its sorrow and its guilt. Eternal life was closed against hope; the pressure of the consciousness of the body of death was terrific. God was not near—the Heavens were as brass. The seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans is a description of man under the Law—is St. Paul's statement of its inability to effect pardon and new life, is an argument to justify his declaration of the death of the believer unto it by the "body of Christ," and serves as an introduction to the thought of man's glorious freedom and sonship in Christ.

It must be remembered, however, that the Apostle did not begin his ministry among the Gentiles by negations concerning the law of Moses. This was not "the mystery," not "the Gospel," he was sent to preach. He moved in the sphere of divine revelation and of positive truth proclaiming Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world. From the revealed truth to his inferences concerning the relation of the law to his Gentile converts the transition was natural enough, but it was fully developed and clearly stated only where the exigencies of his and their situa-

tion required it. Antioch, Philippi, Corinth, Ephesus, Galatia, and other places were visited, and the Gospel was preached to them under its positive forms. Churches and communities were formed. Jesus Christ became enthroned in Gentile hearts, and they were at once the brethren, aye, the spiritual children of the Apostle, without circumcision. The demonstration of the spirit, powers and gifts accompanied the heroic preacher. He labored with all the might of his kingly spirit, "a spirit which trembled before the violence of no storm," to set forth Jesus Christ crucified among them; he labored in travail that He might be formed in them the hope of glory. He beheld the process of the long hidden mystery; he saw the one new man—the spiritual body growing and strengthening, whereof Christ was the life and the uniting principle. Among these Gentile Churches, however, were believing Jews. They perhaps could not feel the force of the Apostle's teachings in full, nor reconcile themselves to religious association with the uncircumcised. Reports of "Paul's Gospel" through these, we fancy more particularly, reached the mother Church at Jerusalem and dissatisfaction soon took the form of definite opposition, while suspicion was transformed into relentless and unscrupulous hate. For, a counter movement was forthwith set on foot, but its first steps we cannot trace. They are lost in the obscurity of unrecorded fact. The names of the men who undertook it have perished from the memory of the world. Suffice it to say, they stood in direct antagonism over against the Apostle Paul, and resolved to preach another Gospel to save the Law and the traditions from contumely and destruction. It was simply a movement in behalf of the Law to which, according to St. Paul, believers *had died*. Its significance for Christian History is that it was an expiring struggle of the law on the soil of the new faith and within the pale of the Church itself. It could not yield its hopes of permanent and universal authority without a conflict. It could not passively behold the ruin of its own supremacy. It must fight for its life; must, if necessary, vilify, persecute and trample in the dust the man who dared desert and pronounce it dead. The old venom of Jewish bigotry breaks forth in the Church. The measures invariably adopted by fanatics and bigots when their shibboleths are in danger, must be employed. It was at Antioch that they began their attack. Antioch was a magnificent city. Under its warm Syrian sky, it could furnish for its own citizens as well as strangers, attractions that eclipsed Imperial Rome itself. As usual with Greek cities, the splendor of the worship of its deities was commingled with most seductive and elaborate arts in

the way of pleasure. Its abandonment to idolatry was a sort of synonym with excessive devotion to amusement. They kept "high holiday" there. The brilliant sun, the cool marbles, the Fora, baths, porticoes, and temples, all sumptuous, were associated with notions of enjoyment. Sacred groves consecrated to divinities, were but shaded retreats for the revels and mirth of the people. The excess to which they were carried may be inferred from the fact that soldiers were forbidden to enter within their precincts. In those days the one strong thing was the Roman army. Even here the Gospel had been preached by brethren who had fled from Jerusalem "upon the persecution that arose about Stephen." These confined their labors to the Jews only. (Acts 11: 19.) Men of Cyprus and Cyrene, however, came to Antioch, and began to preach the Lord Jesus unto the "Grecians."* A great number of them believed and turned unto the Lord. Soon the need of teachers was felt. Barnabas was sent from Jerusalem—(no turmoil as yet)—to carry on the work. He seeing its magnitude and knowing his man, went to seek Saul. The Apostle returned with him, and henceforth this city, owing, we fancy, chiefly to its situation, became for him a center of operations, and the starting point for his missionary journeys. Hither then in due time the zealots for the Law came. They came to put an end to Paul and to his Gospel. They had a message as well as he. "Certain men came from Judea and taught this word, except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." This was their gospel. Christ was a secondary Person in their thought. With this formula they attacked St. Paul as also the citadel of Gentile Christendom. Men were forced to choose sides. The conflict becomes sharp forthwith. St. Peter is there, so is St. Paul, with Barnabas. Peter had been "eating with the Gentiles." Whether by this eating we understand association with them in a free way, in genuine brotherly intercourse, grounded upon the spiritual equality of the members of Christ, or whether we limit it to communion with them in the breaking of bread, the principle is one and the same for us. He yields before the clamor of these Jerusalem partisans. He dares not encounter their fierce rage. He secretly withdraws from his Gentile brethren, and Barnabas himself, the steadfast friend of Paul hitherto, is carried away by his dissimulation. This is a comment upon their activity and influence. Paul is

* "Grecians," i. e. Gentile Greeks, as distinguished from Hellenists. The Text. recep. reads *Ελληνιστας*; but all the modern critical Editors read *Ελληνες*, on the authority of the best MSS.

deserted; but he is faithful to his Lord and to himself. He confronts Peter, and withstands him to his face; accuses him of *hypocrisy*, (*υποκρισις*)—i. e., of action contrary to his own convictions. The entire Church is swayed to and fro by questioning and dispute. It is discovered that a great principle is involved—is Christianity simply Judaism? or is it the fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham? Is it the Law? or is it the mystery now made known for the first time? Like all contests involving ideas, this too came to the minds of most men concerned in it, under a concrete form. The question was narrowed down to the obligations of the Gentiles to receive circumcision. If the Gentiles submit to this rite, that is, if they become Jewish Proselytes, then Christianity as a universal religion, then the Gospel as St. Paul preaches it, must perish. It is ever thus in History. Philosophers and thinkers discuss principles in their abstract form; but the people, in their application to laws, rights, customs, ordinances or privileges. Henry VIII finds Papal supremacy a burden and an intrusion—he breaks with the Pope: Luther aims his blows at the iniquity of the “Indulgences-sales.”—Empires forthwith are torn by controversy: blood flows in torrents, new forms of religious life appear, a new era in the history of mankind is begun. So here in Antioch the life of Christianity as a universal religion hangs upon the issue of the stormy debate—“are Gentile Christians under obligation to be circumcised and to keep the law of Moses?”

Here, then, we have the formula of the Judaizers—ye must be circumcised. How they pressed their notions, how especially they attacked and harried St. Paul, is well sketched by Mr. Stanley.* ‘Every point in his authority which seemed open to question, every trait of his character which could by any possibility admit of a sinister interpretation would be at once turned against him, even though it may seem to us the best proof of his Divine Mission and of his saintly character. “He had not seen the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. 9:1) in his lifetime”—such we know from his own epistle, was the language used concerning him, strange as it now seems to recall it—“his authority was only by man and through man,” it might be from the prophets of Antioch, it might be from those “at Jerusalem who were Apostles before him, (Gal. 1:1, 17.) He was only a Jew of Tarsus, not of pure Palestine origin like the original Twelve, (2 Cor. 11:22; Phil. 3:5,) with no letters of commendation from the mother Church at Jerusalem, (2 Cor. 3:1,

* Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age—a work which has not received, at least in this country, the attention it merits, though it should be read with caution.

10:18, 12.) His very appearance and conduct betrayed the hollowness of his claims. "His letters," indeed, from a distance were "weighty and powerful," but his "bodily presence was weak, and his speech contemptible," (2 Cor. 10:10.) His "infirmities in the flesh" were manifest to all, (2 Cor. 11:30; 12:10; Gal. 4:13.) Even he himself had confessed that he had "no excellency of speech or of wisdom," (1 Cor. 2:1, 3.) Even the Heathens round about, whilst in Barnabas they had recognized the majesty of Jupiter, in the insignificance of Paul had observed only the chief speaking of Mercurius, (Acts 14:12.) He was conscious himself of his inability to carry out his authority; he fixed and unfixed the times of his coming; he used "lightness," and the things that he purposed, he purposed according to the flesh, so that his vacillating intentions were alternately "yea, yea," and "nay, nay," (2 Cor. 1:17,) "in absence only, he was bold towards them, in presence he was base," (2 Cor. 10:1.) He made a great boast of receiving no maintenance from the Greek Churches, but the real reason was that he did not venture to exercise that true apostolical privilege. He worked with his own hands, only because he "had not power to eat and drink" (1 Cor. 9:4, 6; 2 Cor. 11:10) at the cost of the Church. He remained single only because "he had not power to lead about a sister as a wife," like the other undoubted apostles, the great saints of the Jewish Church, "the brethren of the Lord and Cephas," (1 Cor. 9:5.) And yet all this seeming simplicity was merely a cover for serving his own interests. Every one knew how easily he could "become all things to all men," (1 Cor. 9:22.) Was there no fear lest "his exhortations should not be of deceit and uncleanness and guile;" "flattering words and a cloak for covetousness, (1 Thes. 2:3, 5,) in fleshly wisdom; "dealing in the hidden things of dishonesty;" "walking craftily and handling the Word of God deceitfully," (2 Cor. 1:12; 2:17; 4:2,) "with secret meaning," (2 Cor. 3:12,) "writing other things than would be read or acknowledged" on the surface? (2 Cor. 1:13.) In this very matter of the refusal of maintenance, "be it so, he in his own person (*εγω*) did not burden them, but being crafty he caught them with guile;" whilst pretending to receive nothing from them himself, and on this ground, he yet contrived to "make a gain of them by Titus, and those whom he had sent" (2 Cor. 12:18) to collect the contribution which was to be ministered through him to the poor Christians in Judea, (2 Cor. 8:20, 21.) In such style was the Apostle attacked and opposed. The Judaizers were ready to move Heaven and earth to strip him of his well gained influence, to destroy the prestige of his name and power

in all the Churches of Christ. They sought to destroy his gospel by destroying him. By hoping to make him appear contemptible, they trusted that they could undo the effect of his teachings, and bring in their own traditions, and secure the triumph of the Law. How well they understood their work: only they forgot that the great God had and kept the disposal of events in His own hands. Over against their scandalous defamations and detractions, by which they sought to exhibit St. Paul in the light both of an apostate and intruder, they set forth their own claims to be considered as true exponents of the faith of Christ. The scene of the conflict is soon transferred from Antioch to Corinth, Ephesus, (Acts 20: 29,) Galatia. The broad theatre of St. Paul's activity soon resounded with the clamor of faction, was agitated by grave doubt calling forth the fears of the Apostle, while they quickened his labors. Often and often in weariness of spirit he went on his way, fearing, it would seem, lest his adversaries, powerful and numerous, should hinder the course of the Gospel and destroy the souls for whom Christ had died. He was troubled on every side, yet not distressed, perplexed but not in despair, persecuted but not forsaken, cast down but not destroyed. By his personal presence, by entreaty and argument, by letter, in every way like a great Leader, girding himself for battle with a wily and dangerous foe, he is a presence and power to keep together the Churches in the truth he had so nobly maintained. They tracked him "as vultures their prey." Whithersoever he went, they went. Wheresoever he preached, they preached. Whomsoever he told ye are dead to the Law, they told, unless you keep the Law, ye cannot be saved.

Here, then, is a controversy which affected in greater or less degree the entire Church. On the one side are the Judaizers, determined at all hazards to preserve the Law, to enforce their traditions, to convert the Gospel into a perfected Judaism, active, unscrupulous, possessed of influence that was felt even in the remote province of Galatia. On the other side is St. Paul, almost alone, working with a preternatural energy for the very truth which could secure for the Gospel triumph beyond the limits of Judaism, filled with a noble enthusiasm for his cause, sustained and inspired by the Holy Spirit of God. But this was not the only form of error he was called to combat. There are, in his later Epistles, intimations, and reproofs, and warnings, against a coming evil. The cloud was gathering which hung balefully over the Church of the next century. It had not acquired size and power during his own life time. We refer to Gnosticism and its attendant evils. The dissensions caused by the Gnostics belong, therefore, a little later in histo-

ry; and St. Paul's relation to them, in the way of denunciation, is prophetic, rather than actual. We speak, however, with some hesitation founded upon the obscurity of the beginnings of Gnosticism within the Church. Its rise is to be traced to Alexandria; its forms were Jewish on the one hand, and anti-Jewish on the other. The great party movement, in the full noon of the Apostolic Age, is simply this Jewish one, having for its objects the entire submission of the Gentile world to circumcision and the Law, or else rejection from the Covenant of Grace. The great difference, therefore, between the Judaizing movement in the Apostolic Age and Gnosticism, is, that the former was materializing, and, at the same time, a tangible, concrete thing, full of party vigor, while the other was dim and shadowy, a form of thought rather than a party organization, the time for this not having yet arrived.

St. Paul now disappears. A noble Basilica, one of the wonders of modern Rome, preserves the tradition of the locality where he is said to have been beheaded. To us is there deep meaning in the fact that it is named, *San Paolo fuore le mure*, (St. Paul beyond the walls,) for the spirit of the Apostle is sedulously kept outside the walls of Rome, and "green eyed basilisks" guard the portals of a people's heart. It may well stand apart—a monument; for it is not the symbol of a power living there. But matters were different eighteen hundred years ago. Rome then did not reject Paul. His principle did not perish with him. Still the curtain falls while the action of the drama is in suspense. Darkness, which prevents all perception of the immediate succession of events, overtakes us. We scarcely can tell the effect his Epistles produced upon the Corinthians and Galatians. We know not the effect occasioned by his martyrdom. True, the clamor of party warfare is not heard. Yet we may fairly infer that the Judaizers found great relief when they no longer had to fear his personal presence in thwarting their measures. We cannot suppose, however, that their action ceased forthwith. The head and front of the Apostasy removed, was not victory before them? This, however, is mere conjecture, for the party had no representative or spokesman whose words have been preserved. We only know that the party did not die forthwith. When the development of Church life is hidden, it need not surprise us that this, too, is hidden. The next we see and hear of the Judaizers, after the stormy battles in which Apostles were the heroes, and of which they were the leaders, is in the second century, when they present many of their well known features, though, of course, they appear under such modifications as their outward history and

their inward life and habits would naturally suggest to a reflective mind. They are the same in substance, nearly the same in form. They appear as before, under the form of strict adherents to the Mosaic Law on the one hand, rough, materialistic, hateful, pitiful, and, on the other, under the influence of idealizing tendencies, as Gnostics. For, as we have already noted, Gnosticism has its Jewish as well as its anti-Jewish side—its Basilides as well as its Marcion. There is now, moreover, a singular absence of all great personages; no Peter, no John, to uphold the cause of righteousness and freedom; no able opponent to endanger its onward course. Individual agencies and powers for a little while are almost lost sight of. It is hard to make anything more than a name, even of Clement of Rome, a man beyond all doubt of large and salutary influence in his day. But two things had happened which, at this stage, had rendered the aspirations of the ultra Judaizers thoroughly hopeless.

In the first place, Jerusalem had fallen, before the arms of Titus. In the clash of battle, amid fire and slaughter, the Temple fell, and with it fell the "center of unity," for Judaism as such. As long as it remained, served by the ancient priesthood and filled with worshipping children of Abraham, the Judaizing party had a rallying cry of no mean import and power. They could go up and down the Empire, declaring that *facts* contradicted Paul. The law was dead. Believers had died to it, he said, but was not this false in every sense, since its institutions and priesthood still existed, its Temple worship, ordained by God Himself, was suffering no interruption? What, under such circumstances, could Paul's doctrine be worth? Was it not refuted by the irrefragable argument of fact? And could any man hope for salvation if he turned his back upon this divine Covenant? Such questioning, supported by the fact to which the Judaizers appealed, had its weight with many minds. They pointed to Jerusalem with pride, for it was the ark, the citadel of their strength. The arguments which Gibbon, in his famous fifteenth chapter, has put into their mouths, belong, it seems to us, to a later period in the history of the controversy. They are too abstract. "They affirmed," he remarks, "that if the Being, who is the same through all eternity, had designed to abolish those sacred rights which had served to distinguish His chosen people, the repeal of them would have been no less clear and solemn than their first promulgation; that instead of those frequent declarations which either suppose or assert the perpetuity of the Mosaic religion, it would have been represented as a provisional scheme, intended to last only till the coming of the Messiah, who should in-

struct mankind in a more perfect mode of faith and of worship; that the Messiah Himself and His disciples, who conversed with Him on earth, instead of authorizing by their example the most minute observances of the Mosaic law, would have published to the world the abolition of those useless and obsolete ceremonies, without suffering Christianity to remain during so many years obscurely confounded among the sects of the Jewish Church." Such objections were but as pale moonshine compared with the patent fact of the continued existence of the Temple service. This being engulfed in the abyss, then came the thin logic of men, conscious that their strength was gone. The fall of Jerusalem was the judgment of God upon the merits of the controversy, between them and St. Paul; it was a clear demonstration that the Law was at an end; it was a confirmation of the Apostle's gospel; it was a blow from which the Judaizers never recovered. A gulf of fire henceforth separated Judaism from Christianity.

In the second place, Christianity was spreading with the rapidity and vigor of its own supernatural divine life, among the Gentiles. Every great city of the world had its Church numbering thousands of members, and the Gospel was penetrating into the farthest west, to Gaul, Spain, and even to Britain. Its course was wonderful. Its success was a stupendous miracle. Its power, its spirit, its life, were beyond the reach of imperial persecution, or of popular hate. Its Jewish complexion was almost gone. It had become a great Gentile movement and power. For the Greeks it was Greek; for the Spaniard it was equally indigenious. It was seizing the living world in its multiform and manifold peculiarities; was found to be above all the lines of race or of region. The divorce between Jew and Christian was complete; the Gentiles had become the standard bearers, the soldiers of the Cross. The Gospel which they received, and for which they toiled and suffered, was the Gospel as Paul had preached it. Clement, of Rome, writing to the Corinthians, speaks of the Apostle as the most illustrious example of patience. And, by the *middle* of the second century, the question was mooted whether it was lawful for a Christian to keep the law of Moses.

Here, then, were two causes, each of which alone was sufficient to give to the Judaizing party its quietus. Traces of its spirit, indeed, can be found in the second century, especially in the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions. But it could no longer make any headway. "The times" were against it; God was against it. We have thought it a phenomenon not unworthy of fresh notice, because especially the adjustment of

the controversy connected with it, conveys a lesson for this, and, we may add, for all generations of believers. When we speak of its adjustment, we do not refer to any conciliar action in the premises, but to its end and to the mode of its end.

Irenæus, in writing against heretics and heresies, mentions the Ebionites as a Jewish-Christian sect living apart from the communion of the Catholic Church. They clung to the belief that the observance of the Law was still binding upon men, although they continued to accept Jesus as the Messiah. No one can doubt that these were the successors of the Judaizers of the Apostolic age, the enemies of St. Paul, of the party that wished to identify Law and Gospel. They lingered along for centuries a miserable death-in-life not fed by the juices of the living Church, not blessed by God, not able to do anything or to say any word for the good of men. The Church in Abyssinia, we believe, still continues to practice the rite of Circumcision, and thus the Ebionites, after a fashion, may be said to have perpetuated themselves on the confines of Christian civilization. The Church did not cut them off in technical form, but true to their master idea of the "concision" they cut themselves off. By insisting upon something as necessary to salvation, as part of the new economy which did not belong to it, they lost the Church's sense of the Being of Christ and His work, they misunderstood the entire drift of the Gospel; they rejected St. Paul's view of it and used only a gospel according to the Hebrews. They disappear from the life of Christianity, and Pella is at once a by-word and a wonder alike to Jew and to Christian. The more moderate of them remained within the Church, and their Jewish feelings were soon lost in the stream of Gentile faith. And so the controversy ceased. It ceased because the men who had fomented it, had no longer a thought which belonged to the real fortunes of the Christian Church. The Church no longer cared for what the Judaizers said; its sphere of activity and the level of its thought were different from theirs. The two parted company—the one with a great future before it growing and spreading, the other poor and imbecile, clinging to a past the significance of which it did not comprehend. But the Church in her thoughts and institutions bore no marks of a mere ultraism over against the Judaizers. There was a party, indeed, that repudiated everything Jewish, but it too fell away from the communion of the great body of believers. The Church accepted St. Paul's teachings respecting the Law. It preserved the Jewish Canon of Scripture; it held and recognized the historic continuity and development of Revelation until it reached its culminating point in the Lord Jesus Christ. How absurd to

regard the Catholic stand-point of the second century as a sort of compromise between *Petrine* and *Pauline* Christianity ; absurd in the highest degree when we bear in mind that St. Paul's own words, written in the heat of the controversy, were reverently held from first to last as the truth respecting the relation of the Law to the Gospel. And yet Dr. Baur and his friends assure us that a compromise alone explains the posture of the Church. No wonder that Bunsen speaks of "the Tübingen Romance."

We have seen that the Judaizers finding their aspirations and notions of no avail within the Church separated from it. The controversy died because none were left to do duty in behalf of the Judaizing interest. This is but the symbol of the end of all parties identical in spirit with their own. All along the course of history men are found maintaining with the greatest pertinacity the force and authority of certain institutions or notions which may indeed have been good and valuable in their day, but are so no longer. When this happens, then if they adhere to their position they soon view all interests, human and divine, from the narrow stand-point of their own thought. It soon becomes their all ; and they are all the more violent and bitter just in proportion as they behold the living world moving on in its mighty march and leaving them behind. From the days of the Judaizers all along the course of history, one movement has followed another, party interests have divided Churches and communities ; fierce invective has been heard in the house of God ; fierce hatred been exhibited in the family of Jesus Christ ; things have hung in equipoise, but the false has dropped off, and the Church in the possession of the unchanging truth of the Gospel has moved on. She weds at times indeed other things than true ; appears covered over with the growth of centuries, but the wind and storm of thought carry these away, and that which remains is that which was "in the beginning." Forms of thought undergo modifications and changes. It were folly then to spend our strength upon anything which does not belong to the proper life of the Christian Church. Our party interests, our narrow notions perish. This is the law of the Church's existence. That alone, in the ordering of Almighty God, remains which is essential to her life, her progress, and her final completion.

ART. II.—THE REV. JAMES MURDOCK, D. D.

PERHAPS we need offer no apology for inserting the following Article. It is prompted not only by our own sense of what is due to the memory of Dr. Murdock, but also by the fact of his personal and valued acquaintance with many of the leading divines and scholars of the Church, and still more by the remembrance of his efficient labors in the cause of sound learning and Ecclesiastical History, by which he will long be known and honored by many to whom he was personally a stranger. Besides, the life of so distinguished a scholar, and so excellent a man, may not be without its value, especially to the young men of the present day. The history of the Murdock family, and most of the leading facts in his own life, we take from the "Memoirs of the Class of 1797," published in 1848.

JAMES MURDOCK was born, Feb. 16th, 1776, at Westbrook, Middlesex County, Ct., of Protestant Scotch-Irish descent. His great great grandfather, JOHN MURDOCK, was a wool-comber in Limeric, in Ireland, during the reigns of Charles II, and James II. He married Mary Munson, had one son and three daughters, lost all his property in the siege of Limeric in 1691, and died about the year 1695. His only son, PETER MURDOCK, born at Limeric in 1679, came to America about the year 1700, married Mary Fithin of East Hampton, on Long Island, where he spent most of his life. He accumulated a handsome property, and died at Westbrook in 1753, aged 74. His only child, JOHN MURDOCK, was born at East Hampton in 1706, removed early to Westbrook, became a large farmer, was Major of the Provincial troops, Deacon in the Congregational Church, and Judge in the Court of Common Pleas. He died at Westbrook in 1778, aged 72. His first wife was Phebe Sill of Lyme, who died ten months after marriage. His second wife was Frances Conklin of East Hampton. She bore him thirteen children, seven sons and six daughters, all of whom lived to maturity. She died in 1799, aged 86. Three of the sons of John Murdock, graduated at Yale College; viz, Peter, graduated in 1755, and died the same year; Jonathan, graduated in 1766, became a Congregational minister, and died at Bozrah in 1813, aged 68; James, graduated in 1774, settled over the Congregational Church in Sandgate, Vt., removed to Martinsburg, N. Y., and died at Crown Point in 1840, aged 84. The other

sons were all farmers. ABRAHAM, the eleventh child and sixth son, died at Westbrook in 1777, aged 26, leaving two young children; Anna, who married J. J. Avery of Groton, bore him twelve children, and died in 1817, aged 44; and JAMES, the subject of this memoir. The wife of Abraham Murdock and mother of James, was Hannah Lay of Westbrook, a daughter of Jonathan Lay, senior, and sister of Judge Jonathan Lay of Westbrook. She married, for her second husband, Seth Smith, Esq., of East Lyme, bore him two sons, and died in 1824, aged 70.

JAMES MURDOCK, an orphan at the age of fourteen months, passed his childhood partly in East Lyme, and partly in Westbrook, with no peculiar advantages for education till the age of fifteen, when he commenced fitting for College with his uncle, Rev. Jonathan Murdock of Bozrah. He entered College, poorly fitted, in October, 1793, at the age of seventeen years, joined the College Church in October, 1794, and graduated in 1797,—taking the second appointment in a Class distinguished for talents and attainments. He bore away also the Berkeleian Premium, given to the best scholar in the Class, and to the one who passes the best examination in Latin and Greek. Thus, notwithstanding the defects of his early education, and his youth, he already gave indications of his future eminence as a scholar.

“His class,” says one, “was the first which came fairly under the formative influence of President Dwight, the class of 1797—a class in many respects remarkable. Its first class-meeting, after graduation, was at the close of half a century. At that time twenty-four out of thirty-seven were still living, and twelve of them were present to rehearse to each other the experiences of fifty years. The successive College tutors of that class were James Gould, Roger Minot Sherman, and Josiah Meigs. The effect of their training, under those men and the illustrious President, appears in the stations they have held and in the work they have done for their country and for the world. Such names as Henry Baldwin, (a Judge of the Supreme Court of the U. S.,) Lyman Beecher, Diodate Brockway, (long a Fellow of Yale College,) Thomas Day, (Secretary of Connecticut, and long editor of Day’s Reports,) Samuel A. Foot, (Governor of Connecticut, and U. S. Senator,) George Griffin and Seth P. Staples, (so eminent in the legal profession,) and Horatio Seymour, (U. S. Senator from Vermont,)—show what the class was. Every one of the thirty-seven was a native of New England.”

In the November following, he became Preceptor of the

Hopkins Grammar School in New Haven. Relinquishing that office in March, 1799, he commenced the study of theology under President Dwight. In the following autumn, in conjunction with his Classmate, Rev. John Niles, he took charge, for one year, of Hamilton Oneida Academy, now Hamilton College, at Clinton, N. Y. In September, 1800, he resumed the study of theology under the Rev. A. S. Norton, D. D., of Clinton, was licensed in January, 1801, by the Oneida Association, supplied New Hartford till April, and then returned to New Haven. During the summer of 1801, he preached sometime at Oxford, Conn., as a supply, and spent four weeks in the family of Rev. Azel Backus, D. D., of Bethlehem, both supplying his pulpit and instructing in his private academy. In the fall of that year, he was invited to preach as a candidate at Princeton, Worcester County, Mass. In February, 1802, he received a unanimous call to settle there, and was ordained the June following. For some years his ministry seemed to produce little fruit, but in 1810 it was attended by a revival, in which about fifty persons, most of them heads of families, were added to the church. While at Princeton, Mr. Murdock was a close student, and made considerable advances, particularly in sacred literature. In 1815, being appointed Professor of the learned languages in the University of Vermont, he resigned his pastoral charge and removed to Burlington, where he officiated, not only as Professor of the learned languages, but also as Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy. In 1818, he was elected Professor of Languages in Dartmouth College, an office which he declined. In the spring of 1819, being appointed Brown Professor of Sacred Rhetoric and Ecclesiastical History in the Theological Seminary at Andover, he left Vermont and returned to Massachusetts. In the autumn of that year, Harvard University conferred on him the honorary degree of S. T. D. Difficulties soon afterwards arose between him and the other Professors, respecting his course of duties in the Seminary, which continued several years, and at last issued, in 1828, in his dismissal from the Institution. He removed to New Haven in 1829, where he continued to reside, retired very much from public life, and devoted to private studies and especially to Ecclesiastical History. For a few years he preached and delivered lectures in different places, but of late seldom appeared as a public speaker. He was made an honorary member of the New York Historical Society several years ago; also Vice President, and recently President, of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. He was

likewise Vice President of the Philological Society of Connecticut, of which he was one of the original founders. He was also one of the founders and corporate members of the American Oriental Society, and a regular contributor to its learned Journal. This is an Association of Oriental Scholars, so select that it has no honorary member in America, but three in England, a few on the continent of Europe, and a few in Asia.

In the Autumn of 1855, Dr. Murdock went to Columbus, Miss., where he spent a delightful winter in the family of his son, visiting various portions of the Southern country, and anticipating a return to New Haven in the ensuing Spring; but disease attacked him, his physical powers gave way, and though everything was done which affection could prompt or skill devise to save a life so dear, yet that life continued gradually to ebb, until August 10th, about 4 o'clock, A. M., 1856, when the immortal spirit left its clay tenement for a mansion in the better world.

His funeral was attended by an immense concourse, and every mark of respect was paid, and by every class of people, to the memory of one who, within a few months, had won a large share of respect and esteem. Sturdy men, unused to tears, wept around that honored grave; and the tide of warm-hearted sympathy poured out alike by rich and poor, bond and free, while it could not assuage the grief of far-distant mourners who were denied a last and most sacred duty and privilege to the departed, will yet ever be remembered by them with the deepest gratitude.

The closing years of his life were emphatically those of a Christian scholar, and were spent mostly in the society of his books and of a circle of choice friends. Few, we think, have gone down to their graves having passed a happier old age. The Meetings of the Oriental Society and of the Connecticut Academy, he attended with constant regularity; and yet no Association shared larger in his sympathies as the evening shades of life gathered around him, than that of the "CLUB," so called, composed mostly of retired Christian scholars of various professions, and which are described as "a noble fraternity in our midst, of which he was an honored member—a fraternity made up of Christian thinkers and students, whom the infirmities of age have induced to retire from active studies; but who still tend with careful hands the twin lamps of piety and learning."

To these venerable gentlemen, many of whom he had known more or less intimately for sixty years, his heart went out in strong regard; and among the various tributes to his memory,

his friends cherish none with more grateful emotions than the Resolutions, &c., which we give in a foot-note below.*

We have thus sketched briefly the leading events in the life of Dr. Murdock; and we now proceed to advert to some of the

* THE LATE REV. DR. MURDOCK.—The Club, composed of retired Ministers of the Gospel, and gentlemen of other professions, which meets each week at the house of the Rev. JEREMIAH DAY, D. D., having at their session on Thursday morning, the 21st inst., received intelligence of the death of the Rev. JAMES MURDOCK, D. D., a member of this body, who was absent from them on a visit to his son at Columbus, Miss., deemed it proper, as a mark of respect and affection towards their deceased brother, and as a testimony of their sympathy with the bereaved family, to unite in some open expression of their sentiments on the occasion.

For this purpose the following preamble and resolves, prepared by a Committee, were presented to their body at the next regular session and received their unanimous approval and adoption:

WHEREAS, it has pleased God in His wise and holy Providence, to remove by death the Rev. James Murdock, D. D., from the society of his kindred, from communion with this literary and religious circle, and from his public service in the Church on earth; and, whereas, our brother was highly beloved and esteemed for his ability and faithfulness in all these stations:

Resolved, That we deeply mourn the loss which is experienced from his removal from the scenes of his earthly labors, and more especially his removal from this circle which he was wont so much to enliven and enlighten with his presence. At the same time, we would bow with submission to a wise and over-ruling Providence which has numbered his days, and thankfully acknowledge the goodness of God, who qualified him with eminent gifts of knowledge, wisdom and grace, for doing good among men; and who called him to fill successfully during his whole life, even to a good old age, various spheres of usefulness, in the respective stations of a teacher of youth, a Minister of the Gospel, a Collegiate Professor, a Theological Professor, an associate and counselor of his literary friends, and an author of works prepared and published to advance the cause of Biblical Literature, Ecclesiastical History, and Theological Learning.

Resolved, That we sympathize with the children of the deceased in the sorrow they feel for the loss of a father to whom their hearts were bound by strong and tender ties; and we pray that in the midst of their affliction the Holy Spirit would inspire them with thankfulness for that example of Christian fidelity and parental love in which their father walked before them while living, and for the hope they are now permitted to indulge that he is gone to be with Christ in a higher and holier sphere of existence than any earthly; and that in their bereavement God would make their joy the more to abound in the quickening and

most prominent traits of his character, and to some incidents in his history which we deem deserving of special notice.

"As an author," says one whose language we have before quoted, "Dr. Murdock is chiefly known by his translation of Mosheim's 'Institutes of Ecclesiastical History.' That work is not a mere translation. While it represents in simple and nervous English the exact and terse Latinity of the original, (which the former translation did not;) it reexamines the grounds of every statement, and condenses into marginal notes a great amount of additional matter. Other works in the department of ecclesiastical history may be indispensable to a clergyman's library, but none that has yet been published can be a substitute for Murdock's Mosheim. This work was first published in 1832, and is now republished by the Harpers from stereotype plates. In 1851, he published a translation of Mosheim's 'Commentaries on the Affairs of the Christians before Constantine.' Of this massive work, the first volume had been translated and published in England, and in this edition is republished without any considerable change. The second volume was entirely translated, and the whole carefully edited by Dr. Murdock. Muenscher's 'Elements of Dogmatic History,' a convenient and valuable Manual, was translated by him, and published in 1830. In 1842, he published 'Sketches of Modern Philosophy, especially among the Germans,' a work which has been republished in Scotland. His great work also has been republished by some English bookseller in what English writers call (when speaking of American reprints) 'a pirated edition.'

"In his early Biblical studies, Dr. Murdock had dipped into Syriac, and had gained some rudimental acquaintance with that venerable language. At the age of almost three score years and ten, in the leisure of one who had done with the activities of life, he resumed the study of Syriac, and began to read the ancient or Peshito Syriac New Testament. Delighted to converse with the Saviour and his Apostles in language which was almost identical with their vernacular, he resolved to make a literal translation of the New Testament from that version, which is probably as old as the beginning of the second century. The translation was commenced early in August,

consoling influences of His own love shed abroad in their hearts from His Infinite and invisible presence.

Resolved, That a copy of these Resolves, certified by the Chairman of the Committee, be presented to the family of the deceased.

JEREMIAH DAY.

New Haven, August 28, 1856.

1845, and completed on the 16th of June, 1846. It was published in 1851. Not far from that time the aged scholar began the study of Arabic, pursuing it with habitual diligence as a daily occupation."

"A sermon on 'the nature of the Atonement,' preached by Dr. M. in the Chapel of the Theological Seminary at Andover in 1823, and published by the students, became the occasion of some imputations against his orthodoxy. * * * And yet Dr. Murdock was by no means an innovator in theology, or an extremist. His habit of mind, in regard to the statement and illustration of Christian doctrines, was conservative rather than revolutionary. The breadth of his studies in the various departments of theological learning, and especially in the history of theology, had not been without its effect upon his way of thinking; he accepted no doctrine merely because it was the doctrine of the Westminster standard, or the doctrine of the New England churches; he held himself independent of all human authority; but he nevertheless held 'the doctrines of grace' in the form in which they were defined and defended by the great masters of New England theology—yet, probably, without holding, certainly without exaggerating or overvaluing the peculiarities by which any one of those masters may have differed from the others. His mind was too well balanced for any extravagance, too enlightened and too free to accept the yoke of any narrow school or party."

The nine years which Dr. Murdock spent at Andover formed the most eventful, and in some respects the most important period of his life, and as it has already been made a matter of public record, we cannot wholly pass it by. His Professorship in the Theological Seminary, which he was urged in the strongest manner to accept, promised to give him an opportunity for careful research in that department of study for which he had a keen relish and peculiar capabilities. A Professorship in Dartmouth College was at this time offered and urged upon him, while to sunder his connection with the University of Burlington would involve him in considerable pecuniary sacrifices, and interrupt his prospects of more extended usefulness in that young Institution. The Corporation of the University, on his leaving, "voted that the thanks of the Corporation be presented to Professor Murdock for his able and faithful discharge of the duties of his Office." He yielded to the most pressing importunity, and in July, 1819, became "Brown Professor of Sacred Rhetoric and Ecclesiastical History," and entered upon his new duties with high anticipations of a life of usefulness and happiness. Perhaps no situation could have

been found which promised to be more congenial with his tastes, habits, and feelings. With a meager, but in some respects valuable library at his command, and with a mind thoroughly alive to the duties and responsibilities of his new position, he found himself at once surrounded by young men, many of them ranking as the first scholars in the various colleges in the country, and now ardent, ambitious, eager in their thirst for knowledge; and to these, Dr. Murdock endeared himself. His house was the home of some, and the habitual resort of many. These men saw Dr. Murdock in his strength, and appreciated him. His thoroughness as a scholar, the vigor and grasp of his mind, his keen acumen, his impartial judgment and unswerving truthfulness, his facility and pleasure in imparting knowledge, his frank yet dignified and gentlemanlike bearing in his private intercourse, his entire freedom from everything like concealment, duplicity, and stratagem,—all these were impressed more and more upon the minds and hearts of the young men, and they learned to love and revere him. In their playful moods they might, and were accustomed to mimic others, but they never could imitate Professor Murdock, for the entire absence of everything like mannerism, left them nothing to ape.

At an early period, however, difficulties in the practical working of the Institution began to present themselves; and Professor Murdock foreseeing that there were difficulties which were sure to attend his position, though he did not then understand their nature or origin, determined at once to resign his Professorship at Andover, and withdraw from the Institution; which resignation he tendered, in the Fall of 1820. It was not however accepted, and a modification of its duties, having, as was then supposed, been arranged jointly by the Founder of his Professorship and the Trustees of the Institution, Dr. Murdock withdrew his resignation. The troubles, however, which he had foreseen, soon became realities. First, the appropriate duties of his Professorship, which, in the language of the instrument of endowment, was now to be "the department of Ecclesiastical History as his *primary* service and duties," was interfered with, and he was obliged to see his department, and that too, contrary to a Memorial almost unanimously signed by the students, nearly ignored in the course of study; while he himself was crowded into the department of Sacred Rhetoric, from which he had been formally relieved, and for which, as was well known, he had no taste. This Memorial of the Students, of January, 1827, passed by an almost unanimous vote, and which was in itself an able and manly document,

brought matters to an immediate crisis. For it showed the position which Dr. Murdock occupied in the Seminary, the strong hold which he had upon the confidence of the students, and the high estimate in which both he and his department were now regarded by them. Desperate measures were now resolved upon by his assailants; and at the very next Annual Meeting of the Board of Trustees it was voted that Dr. Murdock's connection with the Seminary be dissolved. All the secret documents pertaining to that transaction are now before us, and they are in several respects a curiosity. And yet, that vote of the Trustees, dismissing Professor Murdock from office, was the only answer to a formal and elaborate Memorial of the great body of the students, praying that Dr. Murdock's department might have its proper place in the course of study in the Seminary. The annoyances which, for many years, had been growing more and more virulent, now amounted to an open and bitter persecution; and the opposition, as we have seen, never relaxed its efforts until its end was accomplished, and he was driven from Andover Hill; nor did it cease even then. Had the tribunal to which the appeal was carried been some other than that which his too trusting nature led him to confide in, the result would, we have no doubt, have been different. So the ablest and most judicious counsel in the country warned him at the time. The history of that unhappy event we shall not now write, though the materials are before us in all their minute detail; but as an act of justice to one whom we believe to have been an innocent and a deeply injured man, we do not hesitate to say that the opposition began and was carried out, from first to last, in a spirit, which, alas! has power, when cherished, to deaden the moral sense, and pervert the judgment, even of good men.

But Dr. Murdock, though cast down was not destroyed. The noblest young men of the country rallied to his side, and poured their warmest sympathies into his wounded heart. And what is more, he lived to see the day when his chiefest accusers, they who had done most to cloud the bright prospects of his maturer years, to thwart his ripened plans of extensive usefulness, and, as was then thought, to effectually blight and destroy his reputation, volunteered a pretty full confession of the past to him, and it was mutually agreed that the past should be forgiven. He freely forgave, for he never cherished one feeling of resentment. All the parties to an affair which at that time filled no small space in the public mind, now sleep in their graves; and who will say that, in justice to all concerned, the record of the reconciliation should not be as

open and as public as was the occasion which called for it. Dr. Murdock felt in the closing years of his life that God had so overruled what seemed at first a most mysterious Providence, that his usefulness, reputation, and worldly comfort had all been promoted by a grievous wrong and an unmitigated evil. His last visit to Andover, where he spent the winter of 1852-3, was one of unalloyed pleasure to him, and he ever reverted to it with feelings of much satisfaction. Thus much we have felt it our duty to say concerning a period of his life, which, as we have already observed, we have no right to pass by in silence. We have used plainness of language, but we have spoken deliberately, and have not uttered one word more than belongs to one whom, in life, we loved, honored and revered, and over whose grave we offer this as a tribute most sacredly due to his character during this portion of his history—a tribute far less than his memory deserves.

Dr. Murdock was a thoroughly learned man. "There are," says one, "learned men, so-called, in modern times, who pick up scraps and ends of learning here and there—who take their knowledge chiefly at second hand, and who sometimes make quite a display in borrowed plumage. Dr. Murdock was not one of that sort, but was learned after the old fashion. While he was a pastor, he made himself a thorough Biblical scholar. The few Hebrew lessons which he had received under President Stiles were seed in a genial soil. Something in his family reading of the Scriptures happened, one day, to send him to the original. The chapter that morning—if we correctly remember the story as we heard it from his lips some four and thirty years ago—was the first chapter of Genesis. With the aid of lexicon and grammar he toiled through that chapter in the original text; and he thought that by some special effort he might read every day in his study the Hebrew of the morning chapter in the family. The attempt was made successfully. He read the Hebrew Bible through, and then read it again, till he was so familiar with it that for a while he read directly from the Hebrew into English in his family devotions. While he was professor at Burlington, he made himself acquainted with German, making a journey to Philadelphia for the sake of hearing the language spoken, and that at a time when Moses Stuart was almost the only scholar in New England who thought that German books could be made subsidiary to theological studies." Such a habit of patient, persistent study made Dr. Murdock at last one of the most profound scholars in the city, where he spent the larger part of his life, distinguished as it is for the number of its really learned men. He was surpassed by individ-

uals in various branches of learning; by one, in Arabic and Sanscrit; by another, in Hebrew; by another, in Greek Literature; by another, in Mathematics; by another, in Mineralogy, Geology and Physical Science; and yet several of these departments were favorite studies with him; and in them he was capable of filling a Professorship in any college of our country with distinction; while in comparative Philology; in the number of Ancient and Modern Languages at his command; in Ancient and Modern Philosophy; in Ecclesiastical and Civil History; in acquaintance with Society and the progress of Civilization in all ages of the world, he had, we think, no peer. The variety and fullness of his resources, the perfect accuracy of his knowledge, and his readiness in making his learning available on an emergency, have often surprised even his most intimate acquaintances. We might illustrate this remark by an account of his private correspondence, in which his aid was sought on a great variety of subjects, and by educated gentlemen in every part of the country. Thus we find him writing to one distinguished scholar, on the *impossibility* of the Divine Nature; to another, on the Nature of the Atonement; to another, on the mode of Baptism in the Primitive Church; to another, on the present phase of German Pantheism; to another, assisting in the translation of a Syriac Manuscript; to another, suggesting the probable meaning of the Phenician Inscription; to another, on the exegesis of a difficult text in the Greek of the New Testament, &c. &c.; and this correspondence continued to the very close of his life.

Of course Dr. Murdock was a dangerous man to that class who attempt to do business in the learned world on a stock of what they call original genius, in other words, to conceited superficialists and flatulent pretenders. He weighed them at a glance, avoided them when he well could, was always kind to them, never disputed with them; but if really brought into collision with them, seldom had occasion to encounter them more than once. If he had not the gift of keen and withering sarcasm of his late learned friend, Professor Kingsley, he had an equal contempt for noisy charlatans in Literature and Science. It would not be difficult to collect a fund of anecdotes illustrating this feature of his character, as rich as any gathered from the life of Sydney Smith, though, we are happy to say, of a somewhat different character; for he never trifled needlessly with personal feelings, and never, under any circumstances, with religious and sacred things.

Dr. Murdock was not what is usually called a brilliant man. That is, if a vigorous imagination, a lively fancy, a fondness for splendid theories, a habit of saying or attempting to say,

dazzling, sparkling, and witty things, a love of mere eloquence of style—if these are necessary to constitute a brilliant man, he certainly never craved such a reputation. But if, and especially at the period when Dr. Murdock came upon the stage—a period when the *prestige* of old-fashioned ultra-New England Calvinism was passing rapidly away, if a well-balanced mind which resisted all tendencies to extremes; a wise sagacity to detect the permanent amid the transient, to search for, perceive, and hold fast, the Truth of God in distinction from the mere Philosophy of Truth; if boldness to throw off the traditional shackles of a school, and to follow fearlessly where an enlightened judgment led him; if a keenness of searching analysis which nothing escaped, and a synthetic grasp which brought the whole field of vision fairly into view, everything in its own order and connection; if a style of writing, clear as crystal, the reflex of his own style of thought; if a wonderful familiarity with the wisdom and learning of past ages, and a retentive memory, which seemed to hold everything which he ever read within its grasp; and yet all this combined with an unobtrusive modesty which instinctively shrunk from everything like personal display; if such manly, gigantic features of mind and heart make a man truly great, then Dr. Murdock was such a man beyond a doubt. Dr. Murdock's mind, to sum its prominent features in a single sentence, was accurate in its perceptions, far-reaching in its grasp, strictly logical and philosophical in its judgments, thoroughly independent in its conclusions and fearless in its determinations. Once sure that he was right, and it was little matter to him who, or how many agreed, or disagreed with him. Truth was to him not a question of majorities and minorities.

Dr. Murdock possessed, in an eminent degree, honesty and truthfulness of character. Whether in the intercourse of private life, or in his public writings as a scholar and historian, few men we believe ever lived more entirely free from everything like a habit of exaggeration. In his estimates of character, in his opinions of men and things, in his statements of historic facts bearing on points of controversy, he seemed ever to bring to the point before him a mind wholly free from bias and partiality. And hence, while in familiar intercourse he was one of the most charitable of men—and few ever heard him speak unkindly of any man—and while he was one of the most agreeable and profitable of companions, so this habit has given to his works, as an author, reliability and confidence in the public mind. This exact truthfulness of statement, which in his mind had all the sacredness of the most religious obligation, qualified, we need not say, in a strong degree, his approbation of some of the more popular Histories of the day. He rarely read them; and when

he did, his marginal notes and references showed with what unsparing fidelity he sat in judgment on their loose, unguarded, or perverted narratives. Those only who knew him well, know with what reverence he looked upon truthfulness of character, and especially as an attribute of the historian.

Dr. Murdock was, more than almost any man whom we ever knew, a man of strict system and method in his habits. He had his fixed hours for sleep, for exercise, and for labor; and from these he never varied except under extraordinary circumstances. He was an early riser, and in the winter often started for his vigorous morning walk before the morning light had begun to dawn. And to this systematic course of living he was indebted for the almost uninterrupted health which he enjoyed, as also for the vast amount of intellectual labor which he performed. He was aided by this habit too, we doubt not, in the attainment of that equanimity of temper in which he always appeared even to his most intimate friends. Few ever saw him off his guard; or, even amid the most trying scenes of life, otherwise than under the most perfect self-control. He seemed, indeed, to those who did not know him well, to have schooled himself into an almost stoical indifference to events which agitate and disturb most men. And yet he was a man of deep feelings, sensitive in his nature, and strong in his attachments. In this respect, his life was in strong contrast with the hap-hazard way of living, and thinking, and acting, which characterizes so large a portion of mankind.

In this connection we are permitted to give the following estimate of Dr. Murdock's character, drawn by one who had long known him well, and who is himself one of the most eminent of American scholars.

"The characteristics of Dr. Murdock, as a student, which have impressed themselves on my mind are the following:—CANDOR, CONSCIENTIOUSNESS, DISCRIMINATION and THOROUGHNESS. I will venture to make a remark on three of these, omitting any notice of the third, not from any doubt of its applicability, but because its illustration requires a better and more minute acquaintance with his works than I possess. I beg leave to premise that these remarks are merely suggestive.

"CANDOR.—It always appeared to me that Dr. M. possessed a very liberal mind. Love of truth seemed to be its governing principle, and to permeate it as a constituent element. Of course, like most men of good feeling, he was attached to the system of that ecclesiastical body in which his early associations and habits were formed, and therefore he adhered to it. But his natural kindness of disposition, and widely extended circle of varied knowledge, disposed and enabled him to take large and liberal views, and to recognize and appreciate excellence wherever it should be found. The same characteristic led him to make

allowance for prejudice of education, and for limited views of truth in persons whose mental horizon was from any cause circumscribed. A calm, dispassionate, and careful investigation of all the literary or scientific evidence bearing on any difficult or controverted topic, coöperated with a sincere desire to secure light and truth.

"CONSCIENTIOUSNESS.—This revered servant of God was conscientious in his habits as a student, and in their practical development. The great object to which he devoted his attention through a long life was, to acquire such moral, religious, philosophical, and general knowledge as tend to elevate the human character; and then to employ these important acquisitions of learned wealth so as to promote the good of others. Such was the sphere of action in which Divine Providence had placed him. And like some celestial planet he pursued his onward course, scattering the warmth of his character, and the light of his mind, all around him. His sense of duty led him to devote much of his time to study, in order that he might be the better qualified to edify by his personal instructions and various publications. He willingly relinquished ease and comfort for the tedious, often unsatisfactory, and sometimes painful investigation of doubtful and obscure points, when the general course of thought and examination required him to do so. And at an advanced period of life, when most men feel that nature requires repose, and are rather inclined to be self-indulgent than to make much vigorous effort, this energetic old man opens a new road for his exertions in the good cause to which he had devoted his whole being. It is said of Cato that he acquired Greek late in life, beginning the study of it when about sixty years of age. But when ten years older, the subject of this notice applied himself to the Syriac language, in order to become competent to translate into English the venerable Version of the New Testament, which was made in that very ancient tongue soon after the age of the Apostles. And he succeeded, and the noble volume is now before the world, a monument of the enterprise, industry, ability, conscientiousness, and practical religious feeling of the venerable learner and translator.

"THOROUGHNESS.—Dr. Murdock's scholarship was thorough. The elements of his character already mentioned very naturally led him to investigate deeply every subject which engaged his attention. The candor and religious tone of his mind would not permit him to rest satisfied with any partial examination. He knew that conclusions based on such examinations must be unfair, and he was too honest to be satisfied with such. It was his purpose to investigate all the data to which he had access; and that not superficially, but carefully, thoroughly, repeatedly, until all the groundwork or elements of truth which they might contain should be completely mastered. And to do this, his natural abilities, well cultivated mind, and steady habits of industry peculiarly fitted him. In preparing a literary notice of any publication, he did not content himself with loose, indiscriminate eulogy or censure, or with some general observations on the subject of the production, such as might be written by one of limited and imperfect knowledge. He made himself acquainted with the character of the book by a careful perusal of its

contents, and then brought to bear upon it the stores of his own well furnished mental repository. For illustration I would refer to his notice in the *Church Review* of Dr. Turner's work on the 'Jewish Rabbies.' Instead of any superficial and general remark on Hebrew Literature, the reader will perceive at once that the subject is handled by one whose competency to express an opinion is the result of an examination of Rabbinical writers themselves, and of some of the best sources of information on the subject. Dr. Murdock made no learned pretence. The Pierian waters that he had drunk were drawn from the bottom of the spring, and he presents them for the refreshment of his readers in their original purity."

We are permitted also to give the following extract from a Sermon preached at the opening of the first term in the year 1856, at the Chapel of Andover Theological Seminary, by the REV. PROF. E. A. PARK, D. D. :

"During our recess from this place, a venerable servant of God, who was once a pastor of this Church, and a teacher in this venerable School; one who, three years ago, stood at this Communion Table, and with beaming eye reached out its expressive emblems to us, his friends and admirers, has been called to his everlasting rest. He was a man of large learning and a good heart. He was patient in toil, and his perseverance, even through his old age, in acquiring knowledge, won our highest esteem. In the decline of life he had the enthusiasm of a youthful student. More and more unreservedly, as he drew near the grave, did he consecrate his affluence of learning to his Redeemer. His faith in Christ became more and more simple. He loved the doctrines that cluster around the Atonement. He died as he had lived, trusting in that Atonement, and his faith has not disappointed him. Many sorrows pressed down upon him during his protracted course on earth; but they chastened his spirit, and fitted him under the kindly influences of heavenly Grace for his peaceful departure to the better land. And as we come together at the beginning of a new Seminary year, does not he form one of the great cloud of witnesses who compass us round about, and while we pray, they praise, and while we praise, they triumph; for they have 'come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.'"

There is one fact in connection with the Rev. Dr. Murdock which deserves in this connection to be recorded and perpetuated. The "*Church Review*" was projected as early as the winter of 1846 and '47, by the present Editor, in connection with the Rev. James Mackay, now of Inverness, Scotland, a thorough scholar and an elegant writer. Our Circulars were issued, responses were received, and plans formed for the speedy issue of the work, when Mr. Mackay's unexpected removal from the country interrupted our arrangements, and threatened to put an end to the enterprise. As for ourselves, we shrunk from the un-

dertaking, and if left to our own wishes should have at once given it up, as, indeed, we had already determined to do. It was at this period that the Rev. Dr. Murdock reassured us, and by his words of encouragement nerved us up to a labor, the responsibility of which was in some imperfect degree felt, though little of its difficulties was appreciated. From that day he took a warm interest in the Review. Every page of it, from beginning to end, he read until the day of his death, and though differing widely from its principles on some points, was to the very last one of its firmest and best friends. The large-hearted liberality, and invariable kindness with which he looked upon the earnest and bold enunciation of principles which we hold sacred, but which were foreign to his views, will ever be to us a pleasing and grateful recollection. He was also a contributor to the Church Review, and besides several learned Notices of important works, the Articles on the "Syriac Ignatian Epistles," in July, 1849; on "Modern Pantheism," in July, 1851; on "Gibbon Confronted," in October, 1854; and on "Modern Millenarianism," in January, 1856, were from his learned pen.

At a period like the present, when Infidelity, more than usually noisy and insolent, is claiming to take Natural and Physical Science under its wing, and is beginning to declare oracularly that there are contradictions between the teachings of Revelation and the discoveries of Modern Science, it may be well to hear the testimony of such a man as Dr. Murdock, as to the claims of Christianity.

"His witness on this point was not more intelligent than decided. Only a few months before his death, he remarked in substance to a friend that the whole result of his investigations had been to confirm the simple faith of his early years. And we have reason to know that as his wisdom ripened, as his soul drew near to the solemn aspects of another world, and above all, as the calm decline of old age led his intellect back from the cold, proud heights of mere learning into the region of feeling and desire, where the heart is knit to Christ, enjoys a perpetual youth; we have reason to know that as these processes went on, he regarded with increasing suspicion all philosophical refinements of Revealed Truth, and all the quibbling cavils of modern sceptics, and reposed with a more undoubting confidence upon the great facts and elementary verities of the Christian system." Dr. Murdock never, we think, had any sympathy with the tendency always so strong in New England towards a speculative and metaphysical Theology. And the Philosophy of the Schoolmen, which more or less underlies all New England Divinity, a Philosophy which limits the attributes, declares the purposes, and judges the motives of the Supreme Being,—

a Philosophy which crept into the Church as early as the sixth century,—this whole system of metaphysical speculation never, we believe, had any share of Dr. Murdock's confidence. And yet the formal expression of doctrine, as always held by the orthodox of New England, Dr. Murdock received and maintained. And we know with what intense dislike he viewed recent attempts to graft a German Neological element into the theology of New England, and that too on the part of men who are but the merest novices in German Literature and learning. He understood too well the character of the genuine article to be taken with such a miserable pinch-beck imitation. Dr. Murdock's thorough distrust, and rejection even, of all metaphysical refinements and speculations in theology, and his most cordial reception of the great distinctive doctrinal facts of the Gospel, were strong points in his character, on which there is no room for dispute. And such distrust in the case of one, like him, capable of detecting the subtlest metaphysical distinctions, and his most cordial belief in the simple facts and truths of Divine Revelation as they have ever been held and taught in the Church, is a fact not without its value at the present day, when men claiming to be scholars are seeking to undermine public confidence in God's written Word.

If we were to attempt a complete portrait of Dr. Murdock's character, we should need to speak of his early orphanage, and his being thus led to the formation of habits of self-reliance; of his insatiable thirst for knowledge, and his early efforts to procure a Latin Grammar and Dictionary, which were studied at first secretly, and only in the intervals of severe manual labor; of his character in maturer life, and especially as a pastor, preacher, and college professor, in each of which relations he won that enviable distinction which the true metal always receives over its tawdry counterfeit; we should need also to describe more particularly several traits in his character to which we can now only allude; such as his entire freedom in his advancing years from the infirmities of temper which often characterize old age, as petulance and moroseness—his youthfulness and vivacity of feeling, and his pleasure in witnessing and ministering to the enjoyment of others—his amiability and kindness of manner, by which he won the hearts of children to himself—his taste for theoretical and practical mechanics—his thorough familiarity with the political and civil affairs and changes among the nations of the earth—his interest in the progress of modern discovery—his remarkable talent for conversation, and his power of adapting himself to all classes of society, so that there were few employments and pursuits in which he did not seem perfectly at home. Indeed, there was in him such

a versatility of talent, and such a variety, fullness, and accuracy of resources, such an evenness and symmetry of character, as rendered him, in our judgment, one of the most remarkable of men.

In looking back upon the life and character of Dr. Murdock, there is one respect especially in which that life deserves to be held up as an example to the young professional men of the present day; and that is, the persistence with which he kept up, even to the last, the habits of a diligent student. See him, for example, at the age of seventy years, the fatal three-score and ten, when most persons yield to the infirmities of old age, yet see the venerable Doctor catching a glimpse of the New Testament, the Life and labors of the MESSIAS, in the very vernacular of the Apostles themselves. Its freshness of manner and style, its simplicity and evident truthfulness of meaning, at once arrest his attention. He can at first get no good Grammar of the Ancient Syriac; and so he *makes* one for himself, tracing out step by step the forms and conjugations of the Syriac Verbs; and doing the whole with an air of perfect neatness and scholarly elegance which would have charmed an old copyist of the Middle Ages. At last his work is done; and we of the nineteenth century are permitted for the first time to follow in the footsteps of the Apostles, and hear them not in the pure and classic Greek of the Schools, but in their own simple and artless way tell how they understood the GREAT LIVING TEACHER. Of all his literary labors there was none to which he reverted with more pleasure than to this translation of the Syriac New Testament.

Dr. Murdock, just before his last journey to the South, entered thoroughly upon the study of the Arabic language; and here the same old trouble met him, the want of a really good Arabic Grammar; and he met the difficulty now as he had met it nearly ten years before. We have before us, in almost the last handwriting of the venerable octogenarian, the full conjugations of the Arabic Verbs, regular, irregular and defective, &c., in which he noted and marked every change in form and signification with that same precision and elegance which would become the youthful student of twenty years. Beyond a question this is one of the most wonderful productions of the Nineteenth Century; it shows that the intellect and heart of the American people are not altogether given up to the grossness of material pursuits; it is an achievement which at least will not suffer in comparison with the proudest material triumphs of those whom this physical and commercial age regards as its great and successful men. Nor ought such an example to be lost, especially upon the young students of our country. And yet see how most

of them at their very entrance upon the active duties of their profession, at once throw away their Latin and Greek Classics, their Hebrew and Greek Bibles, lose all relish for active study, read little else than the newspaper and pictorial literature of the day, and soon degenerate into the mere dull and stupid perfunctorist, and their official teachings become little else than an endlessly recurring series of stale truisms and empty platitudes. There is, after all, but one path to the Temple of Wisdom; and the life of Dr. Murdock is proof that patient, persevering, life-long labor is absolutely indispensable to him who would successfully follow after it.

We have omitted till now to speak of the most important feature in Dr. Murdock's character; that is, as a religious man. His own description of himself, as given to his Class in 1847, and published in their "Memoirs," is, that "He is a strict Congregationalist, associates with the orthodox, but calls no man master. Without attaining full assurance, he has never relinquished his hope of salvation through divine grace. He is familiar with death and the grave, and relying on the mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ, he is calmly and cheerfully waiting for the time when he must bid adieu to all sublunary things." Dr. Murdock thus declares himself to be a "strict Congregationalist;" and such he was, and a thoroughly consistent one. If any of the readers of the *Church Review* are disposed to ask, how a man of such unquestionable learning could adopt and hold tenaciously Congregational notions of Church Order and government, we can only answer by quoting the following Question and Answer from the "Congregational Catechism," of which he was mostly the author.

"Ques. 7. What authority has the *mere* example or practice of the Apostolic age in respect to the organization and government of churches?"

"Ans. It has not the authority of a *law*, obligatory upon all succeeding ages; but it is an exemplification of Apostolic wisdom and prudence, in adopting suitable rules and regulations for the infant churches, in that age and state of the world."

Dr. Murdock's personal religious character was much more a matter of principle than of mere emotion. It was not destitute of emotion; for he had within him a fountain of deep feeling, of the intensity of which a stranger would not dream. For one, whose calm, contemplative mind had gone over the whole subject of personal religion with such deep anxiety and such searching analysis—its nature, its reliability, the ground of his own personal belief and hopes, such a mind had within itself depths of emotion not less real, because, like the majestic river, noiseless. And yet his religion was manifested in the

even tenor of a placid life, in the systematic and constant performance of the ordinary public and private duties of the Christian calling, rather than in the language of cant or pretension. But his religion was an earnest and living thing, as those who knew him best will bear witness.

One who was often with him during his last sickness, and who ministered to him the consolations of the Gospel, (Rev. Dr. Buck,) thus describes his closing hours: "Those who knew Dr. Murdock, will not require to be told that he had been long looking for and expecting the death-summons; and, as the messenger approached, he waited patiently and serenely his change, strong in faith and full of hope. No cloud was suffered to hang over his future prospects, nor the least aberration of intellectual perspicuity to embarrass him during his confinement. As he never was a rapturist, even in health, so his last hours were not characterized by high impulses and exultant anticipations of heavenly glory; but by the *firm trusting* of an abiding faith, and a good hope, entering to that within the veil. The writer of this sketch visited him as often as prudence indicated, and at every interview had his heart greatly refreshed by the exhibitions of earnest faith, fervent love, and buoyant hope, by one so near the spirit land."

His desire to return to New Haven and die in the midst of his kindred and acquaintance, was very strong—for he possessed strong local attachments—but when assured that his days were nearly numbered, he yielded all anxiety, and declared, "the tie which binds me to earth will soon be severed, but I feel resigned to meet my God." His last act on earth, visible to mortal eye, was to lift his hand, even then cold in death, and point upward to that bright and beautiful land of the blessed which seemed just opening upon his departing spirit. Who can doubt that, with him, faith is now lost in sight, and hope is swallowed up in joy?

We have thus presented a brief, and, as we feel, a most imperfect sketch of the life, labors, and character, of the REV. DR. JAMES MURDOCK. The perpetuity of his name and of his fame does not depend upon our feeble endeavors. He has erected his *monumentum aere perennius*; and he will live as long as sacred literature has a place in the hearts of a Christian people. They who knew him only by reputation will, we trust, not be unwilling to see even this imperfect description of what he was; and, for ourselves, we have only discharged a painful yet a pleasant duty in thus lingering over the memory of one who was as remarkable for his private virtues, as for those noble talents by which his name and reputation will be embalmed forever in the gratitude and respect of his fellow men.

ART. III.—THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT.

1. *Eutaxia, or the Presbyterian Liturgies.* Historical Sketches by a Minister of the Presbyterian Church. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1855.
2. *The Liturgy of the Church of Scotland*, or John Knox's Book of Common Order, as prescribed by the General Assembly, and used in the Church of Scotland at and after the Reformation. Edited and carefully revised by the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, M. A., Minister of the Scotch Church, Crown Court, Little Russel Street, Covent Garden. London: 1840.
3. *Mercersburg Quarterly Review.* July, 1856. Art. I.—Liturgical Worship. By a Presbyterian Divine.

THE publications, whose titles we have given above, are among the many indications now existing, of what may very properly be called a Liturgical Movement. It is very certain that there is such a movement, both in England and America, among those who have been hitherto most deeply prejudiced against all Forms of Worship. What will be the issue of this movement, and how far it will carry those who are engaged in it, no one can foresee, as yet; but that there is a reality about it, and that it will result in something, no one can doubt who is at all familiar with the subject. It is now about fifteen years since Dr. Cumming, the popular Scotch preacher of London, published the *Old Liturgy of the Church of Scotland*, with a carefully written preface, in which he ventures the opinion that "for the great mass of people, the partial use of a form of prayer would be truly valuable." This book, at last, attracted the attention of the *Edinburgh Review*, and an elaborate article, written evidently by a Presbyterian, and which is altogether favorable to a partial introduction of a Liturgy into the Church of Scotland, makes these four points as the result of an independent Scriptural examination of the subject:

"1. That the Lord's Prayer is the only form of words, the use of which is enjoined in the New Testament.

"2. That the uniform practice both of Christ and his Apostles was such as to indicate their approval of ritual prayers.

"3. That extempore public prayer, on ordinary occasions, is nowhere recommended or even sanctioned.

"4. That extempore prayer, even in public on extraordinary occasions, is sanctioned by Apostolic example."

The evident design of the writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, is to advocate the use of Forms in public worship.

Under the title of *Eutaxia*, expressive of the beauty and order of Divine Service, a Presbyterian clergyman of this country, a son of Dr. Baird, (we name the Author or Editor with pleasure, for the high tone and Churchly spirit of his book,) has published the *Genevan* and the *Scottish Liturgies*, *Baxter's Reformed Liturgy*, *The Reformed Dutch Liturgy* and the *Palatinate Liturgy*, &c., &c., with interesting historical sketches, serving to show that early Presbyterianism was not opposed to Forms, and also, indirectly, that the use of Forms is not inconsistent with the deepest spirit of devotion. The work is very happily conceived and executed, and it cannot fail to exert a very healthful influence, wherever it is read. The object which the Author has in view, appears in the following quotation:

"It is quite evident that it (the *Directory of Worship*) * * * * does not meet all the wants of public devotion, nor answer all the ends of an aid to public prayer. It defines and arranges the parts of Divine Service; but it does not furnish forms of language suitable for their expression. The ready assistance to the minister in conducting, and to the people in following oral supplications, is not supplied by a work whose whole object is to state and describe the constituent elements of worship. There is a necessity palpable and widely felt, for something more than this, to meet the exigencies of the case.

"Does the Presbyterian Church allow or contemplate any such subsidiary provision for the celebration of public worship? Are her ministers interdicted the use of sound and well conceived formularies; and are they shut up to the necessity of original composition for the most solemn, difficult, and trying function of their office, without even the right of previous preparation for the task?

"There is in the Church of Christ a rich and copious literature of devotion, accumulated by the consecrated labors of many ages. Holy men of prayer have been gifted at some periods, as few can claim to be now, with elevation of thought and language necessary for the adequate expression of devout feeling. The period of Primitive zeal produced such minds. The period of reformation in the Church brought out others. Are we, in less favored days, debarred from the fruits of these high spiritual endowments? Do Ecclesiastical rules exclude us from the use of the best liturgical compositions, and force us to rely on our individual resources of conception, however crude and meager, and immature we may find them?

"Such is, undoubtedly, the popular conception of the matter; and the fact of its general, if not universal prevalence, has led me to attempt an exhibition of the true theory, and the normal practice of our Church in this particular. It will be my object to demonstrate, first, that the principles of Presbyterianism in no wise conflict with the discretionary use of written forms; and secondly, that the practice of Presbyterian Churches abundantly warrants the adoption and the use of such forms."

An Article in the *Princeton Review*, which is ascribed to Prof. Hodge, commends the argument of *Eutaxia* to the favorable notice of its readers, and openly advocates a reform in the public worship of the Presbyterian Church.

That there is a reality in this movement, is apparent from the incidental information that is given of the necessity of some action in this matter to sustain the interest of public worship, and to meet the increasing power and attractiveness of the Church of England, and of her daughter in America.

In Scotland there have been large accessions to the English Church. "A large body of persons," says the writer in the Edinburgh Review, from whom we have already quoted, "for the most part of the highest class, as regards both station and intelligence, is withdrawn from the National Church because they greatly prefer the English Church Service to extemporaneous prayer; and was it wise to alienate them, or is it prudent to keep them estranged on such grounds? If a large body of her members call for a Liturgy, is it wise, or prudent, or right, to withhold it?" When people talk in that way, it is clear that they are in earnest.

Says the Duke of Argyle: "Among the numerous families of Scotland, who, since the Reformation, but more frequently in later times, have left the communion of Presbytery and joined that of the English Church, very few have been induced to do so by any previous conversion to Church principles. * * * * But the deeper source of the *extensive alienation which has taken place*, is to be found in the superior attractions of a more ritual worship, in the weakness of a predominantly dogmatic and informal system to keep up permanent attachment in times of religious peace, as well as in some more positive objection to which such a system is exposed." The testimony on this side of the water is precisely similar.

"The experiment," says Mr. Baird, "of that mode of dealing with the subject of Public Worship, by which everything is left to the unaided individuality of the Minister, has been fully tried. For nearly two centuries, in the face of all historic precedents, at variance with all other denominations of Christians, and in conflict with their own earlier principles and practice, the Calvinistic Churches of Great Britain and the United States have faithfully adhered to this method, unknown in Ecclesiastical experience, before the sittings of the Westminster Assembly. We believe that the times are drawing near, when, by general attestation, that method will be pronounced defective. * * * * No candid person, familiar with the actual condition of our churches, can refuse to confront this fact: that by so much as the public worship of God may be rendered attractive, may awaken interest and excite and sustain devotional feeling; by so much have we lost power and influence as a church. * * * * Evidently the young are not drawn into our congregations by any beauty or impressiveness of our services; their attachment is not won by interest in the devotional exercises of the sanctuary."

A Presbyterian Divine, in the last July Number of the *Mercersburg Quarterly Review*, whose name we would like well to know, and to whose Article we shall soon refer, thus

bears his testimony to the wide-spread feeling of dissatisfaction among the Calvinistic bodies:

"It is a simple matter of fact which we feel constrained to account for upon purely intrinsic reasons, that the Episcopal congregations of our land are the most faithful among us, to their own form of worship. * * * * It is equally a matter of fact, that the unliturgic churches of our land have not that in their mode of service which has succeeded, after any positive sort, in exciting the enthusiasm or winning the hearty love of the people. On the contrary, the general unsatisfactoriness of the extemporal service, has come to be a matter of serious complaint. It is painful, but it is truth, and the acknowledging of the truth will do us good. * * * * To our mind, the fact of an inattentive and irreverent congregation, is a momentous wrong; and we hold that if the Liturgy offers to correct this state of things, then it is the Church's duty to make the trial."

This testimony is sufficient, we believe, to show that there is an unwonted interest manifesting itself among the Presbyterian and Congregational bodies of Christians. The Dutch Reformed Church is openly discussing a revision of their Liturgy, with a view to its more general adoption. We are confirmed in the opinion that this is no mere passing interest—no temporary and spasmodic movement, from the fact that it is in harmony with our advancing civilization. The taste of our people is becoming more refined and cultivated, of which we have full proof in many forms of social life.

Church architecture and Church Music are receiving in our day no little share of attention. The old prejudice against Gothic Churches and against chanting is fast wearing out, and there is a strong taste growing up among large classes of Christian people for beauty in the worship of God. All this feeling points directly to Liturgical worship, and makes the inconveniences of the extemporaneous mode more manifest.

But, our readers will observe that in this whole movement there is not the first sign of deep Church feeling—no longing for unity, no sense of the evils or the sin of schism, no doubts as to the essential rightfulness of the position of the various denominations into which we are divided. That there are those, here and there, who are led to the adoption of Church principles, we know, but certainly there is no movement in this direction, and nothing that will give us any ground to hope for a speedy change in the relative position of the Christian bodies towards each other. This movement is strictly denominational and sectarian, and the various sects that separated from the Church of England, desiring all the time to be as much unlike her as possible, are now, many of them, seeking to adopt as measures of self-preservation the very thing which their ancestors discarded.

And to this peculiarity we desire to call special attention, from its bearing on the Liturgical questions which are now the subject of discussion in our own Communion. It has been seriously argued that our Liturgy, with its fixed forms, is a bar to Church Unity; that there are many persons ready to adopt Episcopacy, who are deterred by its accompaniment of an unvarying Worship, and that if we would allow these persons something of that liberty to which they are accustomed, we should receive large accessions to the Church. Now, we confess, we have no very great respect for this argument of expediency. We are somewhat familiar with the reasoning with which the non-conformists strove to vindicate their course which resulted in their separation from the Church of England, and we doubt not, in the least, there were good reasons for not yielding to their many frivolous demands.

But there is now, so far as we are able to perceive, no such class of persons in existence. There is no body of men anywhere, that would be conciliated or attracted to the Church, by Liturgical concessions. We might reduce ourselves entirely to the level of the non-Liturgic bodies around us, so far as Worship is concerned, without advancing in the least the cause of Episcopacy, or Church Unity. How many Congregational, or Presbyterian, or Methodist, or Baptist clergymen, would be induced thereby to receive Ordination at the hands of a Bishop of the Church? How many laymen of these several bodies would forsake their pastors from a feeling of the sin of schism? The truth is, the whole tendency of things, from the natural working of sectarianism, has been downward from the beginning of the Non-Conformist movement, and though there are some signs of a reaction in our day, yet that reaction has commenced, if at all, just where it naturally would commence, in those matters which are obvious to all, in the Worship of the Church. There is no proof that the Calvinistic bodies, (we use this term simply for convenience,) are in the least softened towards Prelacy, or suspect that they are guilty of the sin of Schism; but they are beginning to perceive, that their way of Worship is inferior to the old Church way that they abandoned, and so they are determined to adopt that way, in part at least, and perpetuate as long as possible the separation.

Let us see what chance there is of their success. Will they be able to return to Primitive and Churchly Forms of Worship? It is said of the late President Dwight, of Yale College, that when a brother clergyman enquired why they could not have a Liturgy, as well as the Church people, (of which they greatly stood in need to restrain the irregularities of Worship,) he

simply answered him by the enquiry, "Who shall prepare it?" And this is the difficulty which every person who has written on the subject has, tacitly at least, acknowledged. It is conceded on all sides that no Doctors in Divinity, no General Assemblies, nor Associations in our day, are able to *compose* a Liturgy; but it is maintained that a Liturgy may be compiled out of preëxisting forms, and some there are who would make the Calvinistic forms the basis, and others who would take the earlier Rituals; and these, they think, if modified to suit the times, could meet the wants of the present day. Now we have strong doubts whether it is possible to revive the Liturgies of Calvin or of Knox, and still stronger doubts, whether any modification of the Ancient Liturgies can meet and satisfy the spirit of modern Presbyterianism or Independency.

The history of Puritanic Liturgies has not been such as to inspire much hope respecting them. What has it been but a history of failures? There are a few facts in this connection that are full of meaning. In 1557, the Liturgy of Knox was sent over into England. It was sent over to be used in England. It was dedicated to his brethren in England. The Non-Conformists were not satisfied even with the second Book of Edward; Knox never heartily approved the English Liturgy; he thought it savored of the ancient superstition, and therefore from his safe retreat he sent over to his suffering brethren, his ideal of a pure and Scriptural Liturgy. How far this Liturgy of Knox was used in England we have no means of knowing; but in Scotland, when the Presbyterian religion was established, it became the common order of the Church. It was established as the Scottish Liturgy.

But the Scotch Presbyterians soon wearied of their Liturgy. It gradually fell out of use. No one knows when it was at last abandoned, but at the end of a quarter of a century there was not probably a Church in the kingdom where the Liturgy of Knox or any other Liturgy was used, and at the end of a hundred years, at the Meeting of the Westminster Assembly, the Kirk of Scotland joined with the Presbyterians of England in establishing the Directory of Worship. This is the first fact. The Liturgy of Knox not only failed in England when placed side by side with the Church Liturgy, but it failed in Scotland when it had free scope and was supported by authority.

The history of the Directory of Worship is not more encouraging. At the sitting of the Westminster Assembly, the Church of England was entirely prostrate, her Liturgy was proscribed and her clergy scattered. Presbyterianism was in the ascending and the Kirk of Scotland formally abandoning its Common

Order which it had not in fact used for many years, adopted the Directory of Worship, which was thus established over the two Kingdoms. But this Directory not only failed to assert itself, and to gain a hold upon the English nation, but it has not been an actual directory of worship to those in England, Scotland or America who acknowledge the Westminster Assembly.

The Conference of the Savoy was the last attempt to reconcile the Puritans and Non-Conformists to the Church of England. The English Prayer Book was submitted to the severest tests. Its enemies were allowed to muster all their strongest arguments against it, nor were they slow to avail themselves of their privilege; and at last they presented a New Liturgy, composed by the celebrated Richard Baxter, which they prayed might be adopted, as well as the Order, and that either of them might be used at the discretion of the minister.

It certainly was not to be expected that the Church party would do otherwise than reject with something of contempt a Liturgy which was constructed on the principle of excluding almost everything that had been formerly in use, but it might have been expected that the Non-Conformists, beaten and repulsed and ridiculed for their presumption, would have esteemed highly this Liturgy which they had thought worthy to be placed side by side with the Prayer Book of the Church of England, and would have used it, all the more zealously and pertinaciously for the contempt that had been put upon it. But it was not so. Baxter's Reformed Liturgy, rejected by the Church, was never adopted by the Non-Conformists; it fell everywhere into practical contempt.

Now these experiments will serve to show that it is no easy thing to make a Liturgy, and impose it on a people; nor is it any easier to impose a dead Liturgy upon them. These reformative Liturgies are not available in our day, for the same reason that they never were available. They were *impositions*; and this is the precise difference between them and the Prayer Book of the Church of England, which is nothing else than the old Service of the Church reformed. The Church of England did not need a Liturgy, nor was the man living that could have composed a Liturgy that would have been received. Her Liturgy had been the growth of centuries; it was rooted in the affections of her people, its words were as music in their ears, its varied Festivals and Fasts had hallowed the whole Christian year. With the reformation of religion there was of course a revision of the Church's Liturgy, but that revision was conducted on the principle of retaining all, in substance and in form, that could be retained. *This*, which was the great

offense in the eyes of the Puritans, was the special excellence and glory of the English Reformation.

The Mercersburg Reviewer is astonished at the immeasurable superiority of the Prayer Book to the Liturgies of Calvin, Knox, and Baxter; and the Edinburgh Quarterly is forced to say that "the Liturgy of the Church of England, notwithstanding some faults, is, perhaps, the most perfect of existing Liturgies." Now it is very pleasant to hear these acknowledgments, which we might greatly multiply; because it was by alledging manifold and deadly errors in the Prayer Book, that the Fathers of the Presbyterians and Independents sought to justify their separation from the Church of England; and if the Prayer Book be so excellent as many of them are now ready to acknowledge, then this separation was entirely without justifying cause.

But it was not the intrinsic excellence of the Prayer Book, as contrasted with the Calvinistic Liturgies, that gave it favor. The English people did not calmly choose between the two and decide upon the merits of the case. This Prayer Book of the Church of England, after all the changes that it underwent through a long period of revision, gave still to her sons and daughters the Old Creeds, the Old Psalms and Hymns, and spiritual songs that their souls loved; they still heard the voice to which they had been accustomed to yield glad submission, and and hence while the Liturgies of the Reformation, as the Edinburgh Review declares, are probably less known to the Christians of England and America than the Liturgies of Antioch and Cæsarea, and many persons know not that such Liturgies were ever used, the Prayer Book of the Church of England has lost nothing of its hold on the affectionate reverence of the millions who now find its ancient and time hallowed forms a fit expression of their most profound religious feelings.

And as the endeavor to construct and impose a Liturgy has always proved a failure, so must the endeavors to revive and to impose on any people who have not been trained to them, the Ancient Liturgies. The Mercersburg Reviewer, abandoning the Calvinistic Offices as hopeless, looks to the old Liturgies for help.

He says:

"Why cannot we do what the English Church did, cast off the errors which have accrued to them, mingle the work of the Reformation with them, and adopt them? Why fatigue our souls to no purpose with original attempts in a region which, may we not say, the Head of the Church has already fitted to our hand! For our own part we may say so without hesitation. It is our opinion, that the anaphoral offices of the Liturgies of St. James, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom, bear upon a scriptural comparison, far more Divine marks than the communion or baptismal forms which it has been our lot to find in the pulpits of our Churches."

The answer to these earnest questions is obvious. It is impossible for any body of men, at this day, to do what the Church of England did three hundred years ago. For, that work was a process in her real life. The Church inherited the Ancient Liturgies; they were hers of right, and she "mingled the work of the Reformation with them," because the reformation was an era in her natural life. When the Church of England, under the impulse of the new movement which she felt, proceeded to a careful examination of the Ancient Liturgies; it was with the view of seeing how much of her own loved Ritual she might retain; how many of those Forms which had been long endeared to her children she might continue still to use. The Church of England was never in the condition when she was required to *construct* a Liturgy; she had only to reform her Worship and to purify it; and in fact, this reformation was conducted by men not anxious for change, and who did not seek to make their own impressions a rule for the whole Church of Christ.

To impose a Liturgy constructed out of the Ancient Offices, upon the Presbyterians of our day, would be a work radically different from anything that was accomplished in the reformation of the English Service.

We conclude, therefore, that it is not possible for the Presbyterians, or Independents, ever to enjoy the blessings of a Liturgy through any process of construction that they may devise; but if this movement were to lead the more thoughtful of them to a reconsideration of the grounds of separation, to a calm weighing of the arguments urged by their very zealous ancestors against the Book of Common Prayer, we should hope that many of them would discover that that separation was a serious and fatal error, and that there is no need of their constructing or arranging a new Liturgy at all, because the Church from which they sprung, retained, preserved, and handed down to our times a Service which breathes the spirit of the Primitive and Apostolic Church, and is at the same time the noblest monument of the Reformation.

ART. IV.—THE UNITY OF MANKIND.

1. *The Races of Men*; a Fragment. By Robert Knox, M. D. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard. 1850.
2. *The London Lancet*. For October, November, and December, 1855.
3. *The Westminster Review*. No. 128. April, 1856. Art. 3.

REVEALED RELIGION cheerfully accepts the real facts of real Science. Only narrow minded theologians, or equally narrow minded infidels, can see in the apparent discrepancies which are sometimes fancied to exist between Divine Revelation and human Science any reason for discrediting either of these sources of knowledge. For every branch of human Science itself is beset with these same difficulties. Apparent inconsistencies and contradictions are all around us. These result from the finiteness of our powers, which cannot at once perceive the connecting links or the remote truths which harmonize these seemingly conflicting phenomena. All that true science demands, therefore, is a sufficient warrant for each of two apparently opposing truths. Humble because she knows no more, she is content to hold them both as truths, knowing that the reconciliation exists, although we cannot see it; and patiently and laboriously seeking for the additional knowledge which will bring that reconciliation into view. This is the spirit which is continually enlarging the domain of human knowledge, removing difficulties that seemed to be insuperable, and bringing to light the hidden things of darkness. It is true that every advance in knowledge which clears up one set of obscurities, brings into startling prominence another set in the enlarged scope of observation thus revealed,—for man is finite, and God is infinite in His own works and ways. It is thus that human knowledge is to be ever progressive, ever increasing and enlarging.

The entire scheme of redemption—which is the sum and substance of Christianity—is founded upon the postulate of the Unity of the human race, fallen in the first Adam, and restored in the Second—the Man Christ Jesus.

If the Unity of the human race is established by sufficient warrant of Divine Revelation, no facts, however seemingly inconsistent with that truth, should in the slightest degree shake

or impair the faith of a sensible man in that Revelation. For he only applies here the principle on which he is compelled to act on every other subject: that is, to hold, on sufficient authority, *apparently* inconsistent facts, knowing that the reconciliation exists, and may sometime be discovered, if such discovery be within the range of human powers.

On the special subject of our present enquiry such reasonable and philosophic modesty would seem to be imperatively demanded. For who was with his Maker when man was first ushered into being? What can human Science tell of the origin of man? How came he here, is obviously a question beyond the domain of science. She was not there when the eternal God took counsel with Himself, and said—"Let us make man in our likeness," and therefore she is silent, she can give no response, no solution to the problem of human origin. If she dared to teach at all on this subject, her only utterance would be the gross absurdity of an endless retrogression. But this she cannot teach, and therefore she utters no voice here. Awed into sublime silence by the majesty and mystery of CREATION, she devoutly hearkens to the word of the Almighty—"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created He them; male and female created He them." Gen. i: 27. "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Acts xvii: 26.

But the "science, falsely so-called" knows nothing of this philosophic modesty, or of this deep, adoring reverence. Boldly stalking "where angels fear to tread," this science, with flippant tongue proclaims, that the actual varieties of the human race shut out the possibility of a common origin of mankind. This science contends, in opposition to the only record we have, that we are compelled to allow as many distinct creations or beginnings for mankind, as there are marked and permanent varieties of race in the world.

Now, if we subject the issue thus made with Revelation to the test of a purely scientific examination—if we go upon the very ground occupied by the impugners of Revelation, and look at the question simply in its scientific aspect, as a branch of merely human knowledge, it will appear that the alleged conclusion against the unity of the human race is not by any means *ex necessitate*: that such a conclusion is not inevitable even to our seeming, as a question of pure science.

This will be doing much more than the advocate of Revelation is called on to perform. For if there was to our seeming, irreconcilable contradiction between the two facts—the Unity

and the Variety of the human race—all that true philosophy could do would be to hold them both upon their own independent evidence, knowing that the contradiction is only apparent, and that the reconciliation is just hid as yet from us. But the consideration of all the facts will show that the actual phenomena are not even apparently irreconcilable with the common origin of mankind. Such extended consideration will prove that, as a mere question of Science, the actual phenomena, to say the very least, leave the problem of the origin of mankind undecided—that they are just as reconcilable with one hypothesis as with the other. There is then on this branch of our knowledge no contradiction to reconcile, no apparent inconsistency to explain. And the Bible and the universal judgment of mankind stand forth triumphantly vindicated against this last assault of pseudo-science.

The Bible account of the origin of man was assailed a little while ago by the development hypothesis, which took mightily with the small wits of the day; and which made man to be a self-improved specimen of the lowest form of animal life. True philosophy soon laughed this degrading conceit out of public estimation. None of its admirers like to think of it, or to be reminded of it.

The consideration of this poor abortion brought very prominently into view the permanence of existing forms of life and organization. Following out this single idea to an illegitimate conclusion, the latest development of the "science, falsely so-called" is the assertion of an independent origin for each of the several varieties of the human race.

Neither religion nor philosophy can accept this assertion. The highest philosophy of all—the common sense and the common feeling of mankind—has decided against it always. Man—humanity—are terms of universal use, expressing the universal sense of the common nature, and of the common lineage of the beings whom God created in His own image, and appointed to be His vicegerents in the government of the world.

Leaving out of view this compendious and prompt decision of philosophy in the person of humanity itself, and looking at the subject in its minutest details, true philosophy cannot accept this assertion, because it rests upon no sufficient basis of fact or argument.

All the great lineaments of humanity are common to the whole race. Every distinctive feature of humanity is common to all the tribes and nations of men. A wide chasm separates the lowest form of man from the highest forms of all other animal life. Of the innumerable multitudes thus distinguished from the rest of the creation, every physical power and capacity pos-

essed by one family and tribe is possessed by every other family and tribe. Of these same multitudes every spiritual power and capacity and affection exhibited by one family or tribe is as certainly exhibited by every other family and tribe.

Precisely the same general identity is found in the abnormal as in the normal, in the diseased as in the healthful condition of mankind. The same physical diseases afflict indifferently all men who are exposed to the causes of them. The very same unsoundness and vitiation of mind and heart are actually manifested in every nation, by every human being. Intellect, passion, moral apprehension, and religious affection, are found to be the same in kind among all men. The history of the most distant ages and nations is but a varied detail of the same general facts, of the same social phenomena.

But, how infinite in wisdom and power is the Creator of this wondrous frame of things! In the midst of this universal sameness, how infinite is the variety! Of all the seventy thousand people in the town in which we write, no two of them are so alike that they cannot be distinguished! Of all the myriads of men and women now alive upon the earth, no two of them are so alike that they cannot be distinguished! All have the same general form, the same erect attitude, the same cast of features, the same human physiognomy. But the varieties, at this moment, in this general identity, amount to eight hundred millions, that being the estimated number of human beings now on the earth.

Here is a stupendous miracle of Almighty power and wisdom constantly manifested in the eyes of all men. Is this next to infinite variety in the human race inconsistent with unity of origin? This question is answered in the negative by the experience of every family in the world. The actual concurrence of an endless variety, with unity of origin, is affirmatively proved by the history of every family in the world.

Here the impugner of Revelation interposes, and although compelled to behold the fact of innumerable varieties in the human race, concurring with known unity of origin, insists upon a distinction. Some of these varieties, he says, are so great that it is impossible to believe in a community of origin; and experience proves that these great varieties are permanent in particular races, and are not reproduced in other races. Natural causes are not adequate to the production of these great varieties.

But the lesser varieties would seem to us to be equally inconsistent with unity of origin, if we did not see the fact of such unity coexisting with these varieties every day. The force of

the objection will be removed by a consideration of certain facts connected with these phenomena.

1. The alleged greatest varieties do not consist simply of certain striking contrasts, but, as in the case of color, shade into each other by almost imperceptible degrees, from the fair Scandinavian to the darkest Negro.

2. The scale of color is found to be in a remarkably uniform proportion to the heat and dryness of the various regions of the earth. To this rule there are only a few marked exceptions.

3. All the varieties of *form*, characteristic of different races, are common, in *individual instances*, to all the races of men. You can find individual cases in every community parallel to any of these alleged characteristics of race. This fact alone destroys all the presumed necessity of referring these varieties to difference of origin; because the very same variety is thus seen to be consistent with known identity of origin.

4. It is certain that culture and other causes will produce varieties in vegetable and animal forms far greater than any existing varieties in the human race; and these varieties, when thus produced, become permanent.

5. The indefinable varieties that constitute *family likeness* are as permanent, as far as we know, as any of the alleged varieties of race. If any permanent varieties, therefore, prove plurality of origins, a distinct origin for each family is equally proved by the same reason, which would be multiplying the miracle of creation beyond all the claims of all the religions in the world. But, as we have seen, the widest distinctions of race are but extensions of the mighty mystery of wisdom and power which has ordained the transmissible varieties that constitute family likeness, and the inconceivable multitude of varieties that distinguishes all the individuals of the human race.

6. The advocates of this plurality of origin cannot agree among themselves as to what amount of difference will require the application of their principle. The old classification into five races they now contemptuously reject. Mr. Pickering, the latest original observer, says that there are eleven distinct races. He does not touch the question of origin by this classification, any more than Blumenbach did by his recognition of five races. Knox, a wild declaimer against the unity of mankind, finds several distinct races among the old inhabitants of the British isles. Agassiz tells us that men were produced at once in whole nations—each nation created for its own territory—thus far transcending in poetic license the pretty fable of the heathen Ovid, who relates how the only pair preserved from

the deluge threw stones behind them, each of which suddenly became a man or woman.

7. Many of these varieties are manifestly the result of mental and moral deterioration. Without taking generations into account, we can see the process of physical brutalization commence in the countenance and figure and carriage of persons everywhere who give themselves up to a merely brutal and animal life. We behold the converse of this in the increasing nobleness of appearance produced in the children of degradation by a right physical and moral culture. One of the most painful exhibitions we ever witnessed was the infant school in the Almshouse at Philadelphia. The stupid, animal look of those children of vice and wretchedness, just taken from the dens and cellars and gutters of the city, seemed like a mockery and a caricature of innocent and intelligent childhood. In their new and improved situation the light of intelligence and of affection will gradually begin to illumine their countenances, and the idiotic brutality of look will presently disappear. If, on the contrary, they had remained in their original degradation, and had never been allowed to mingle in a society of intelligent and educated people, that early cast of countenance would have been fixed indelibly.

Every physiologist knows that the entire human figure is modified and indefinitely changed by exercise and occupation. The blacksmith's arm and the porter's leg are familiar examples of this modification. The bony structure of the head and face is subject to these influences in a remarkable degree. And from the softness of these bones in childhood, and their minute subdivision into very small portions, the configuration of the head and face is easily modified by the circumstances of birth and education.

Whatever may be thought of the details of phrenological science, there are certain great, leading facts relied on by its advocates, which have been known and considered from the earliest times. It is certain that the anterior portion of the brain is developed in some pretty definite proportion to the intellectual capacity of the animal, or race, or individual man. When the intellectual powers have never been brought into exercise, the anterior portion of the brain will not grow to its normal and proportional size, the bones will adapt themselves to the form of the organs they are to cover, and there will be a deficiency of forehead. So, where to eat, is the great purpose of life, and yet subsistence is of difficult attainment, all the vital energies of the system will be concentrated on this object, and there will be a protrusion of the lower part of the face—the

jaws—corresponding with the depression of the forehead, and constituting that prognathous aspect which marks the lowest forms of humanity.

Now, let the causes calculated to produce these effects be in continuous operation through a long series of successive generations, and with that cumulative force with which such causes necessarily operate upon successive generations, unless counteracted by some external force, and we shall see a sufficient physiological reason for the principal varieties of form by which the various races of men are characterized. The real wonder will be, not that the forms are so widely separated, but that the original unity has been so strikingly maintained.

The apparent identity of the human race under such various and conflicting circumstances is one of the most remarkable exemplifications of the permanency of existing forms of life and organization. The law of unity has so antagonized and counteracted the many powerful causes of change and diversity, that all men can instantly recognize, in the most cultivated and in the most degraded races of men, the common, the universal, the unchangeable lineaments of a common humanity. The actual identity is far more wonderful than the actual varieties. For it must be remembered that as some tribes, removed from the ennobling influences of true religion, have been sinking in the scale of being and of majesty of form; so, other tribes, elevated in all the faculties of their nature by the direct and indirect influences of revealed religion, have been making a progress upward, in the very opposite direction. Yet, bring the highest and the lowest of these forms together, and every one recognizes them at once as men, the possessors of a common nature, the claimants of a common humanity.

But suppose we put all these considerations entirely out of view. Suppose we allow that the varieties of the human race are so great as to be utterly unaccountable by any known physiological laws; and to be far beyond the reach of the analogies furnished by the varieties, produced by culture and other causes, in other forms of animal nature. We can afford to make these suppositions, because even then the question of the unity of the human race must be decided according to the old verdict of mankind.

Allowing that the diversities could not be produced by natural causes simply, there remain but two possible methods of accounting for them. One of these is the oft-repeated **MIRACLE** of a great number of independent and distinct creations of single pairs, or of whole nations of men. The other is *the miraculous production of these varieties by the sovereign will of*

the Almighty, CONCURRING, for wise purposes connected with the Providential government of the world, *with the natural causes above referred to, and adapting each separate family of mankind more perfectly to its actual position.*

Either hypothesis involves a miracle. For the impugnors of Revelation, while they profess to scout at miracles, do, on this subject, multiply and exaggerate the miracle of creation beyond all the demands of religion or of philosophy. Which of these miracles is the easiest—for God does not waste even His infinite energy? Which of them is most in accordance with existing analogies—with the known laws of human propagation? Why, the latter miracle, if it must be called such, is but a slight extension to race, of the perpetually recurring *law* which preserves an endless variety between individuals and between families. Both these effects should undoubtedly be regarded as miracles in one sense—that is, as exertions of Almighty power and will. But both must alike be regarded as *simple laws of human nature*, once determined by that Almighty will; and differing in their results, not at all in kind, and but little in degree.

Which, then, of these two miracles shall we take? That which resolves itself into a law, which we know to exist, and which we see to be universally operative, producing with ceaseless energy innumerable effects at every instant of time; or the alleged multiplied miracle of distinct creations—of independent origins—of which we have no present experience?

Sound philosophy certainly requires that we should take the former alternative, even were we to leave entirely out of view the Scriptural representation of human nature. This is the plain and obvious conclusion of science and of reason.

But when we bring into the consideration of this problem the additional fact, that a record of human history, proved to be of Divine authority by a concurrence of innumerable testimonies, affirms that there has been but one creation of man; and assumes the resulting unity of the human race as the foundation of all religious truth, the problem is at once and easily solved. The *a priori* conclusion of sound philosophy is thus historically proved to be true.

When that historical evidence is thoroughly studied, its revelations are found to be perfectly coincident with the universal human consciousness—the consciousness, not of one family and tribe, but of all families and all tribes. The only record we have of the creation of man tells of but one creation. And that same record of one manhood speaks the heart language, and tells out the living consciousness of all who claim the name of men.

The one man from whom all are descended was created in the image of God, says the record. And the broken impress of that image is found alike in every representative of humanity, at whatever distance in the social scale, or in variety of form and appearance.

"In Adam," says the same Divine record, "all died." And so, universal consciousness and universal observation concur in proving the oneness, the perfect identity, of human corruption, which is the realization of that fearful death. Here again, in this very corruption of human nature, endless variety is seen to be resolvable into perfect unity. Human transgressions are as varied as human disposition and circumstance. But the corruption from which they all proceed is found to be the same everywhere and under all circumstances.

Again the Record says, "In Christ shall all be made alive," and "ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Accordingly we find that the stirring appeals and the glorious hopes of redemption find the same kindling response in the hearts and minds of all men, of all ranks, in all climes, and of every known variety of stock, caste, form and color.

The certain conclusion of the whole matter is, that the actual condition of the human race in this regard is but another illustration of the universal law of being—UNITY amidst VARIETY. God has made of one blood all the nations to dwell upon the face of the whole earth. And, for wise purposes connected with the economy of the world, the same God has ordained that infinite variety which we behold in this unity. This is the undoubted conclusion of true philosophy as well as of true religion. This is the conclusion which common sense heartily and unreservedly receives.

To this point the present article was prepared, as a sufficient expose of the scientific folly on this subject, which sets itself in opposition to the revelation of the Almighty. But while we were writing, the "science, falsely so-called," consistent only in its enmity to religion, had changed the ground of its assault upon the Unity of Mankind. Under the title of "The Philosophy of Zoology," Robert Knox, M. D., &c., commenced the publication of a series of Articles in the London Lancet, in which he bases his contradiction of the Word of God upon the so-called Transcendental Anatomy. The series, although evidently but just begun, has not been continued, up to the present writing, beyond the number for last December. We may hope that the discontinuance has been occasioned by an unwillingness on the part of the conductors of that Journal, to be used as the agents for conveying to every part of the world

such bold, disgusting, and gratuitous atheism as these papers contain. After reading these papers in a periodical so distinguished and influential, we turned to consider with more attention the previous work of the same author, "The Races of Men." We found the two productions very impartially characterized by the same recklessness, inconsistency, and self-contradiction, combined with a philosophic air, well calculated to impose upon the unreflecting. To multiply instances of his contradictions would be tedious and unprofitable. One will be sufficient, as it will let us into the heart of this new philosophy. In his book on "The Races of Men," Knox states and denies the doctrine of Hippocrates, that "external circumstances modified human structure and human character." That to the circumstances summed up in the expression, "Air, Water, and Place might be traced all differences in the form, complexion, and mental qualifications of men." "That such alterations become in time permanent, transmissible by hereditary descent." Knox says that this doctrine "is contradicted by every well ascertained physiological law, and by all authentic history." p. 65.

Most persons will be surprised after reading this to learn, that Knox in this same book, and yet more distinctly and elaborately in the London Lancet, puts forth this very doctrine, modified by the Transcendental Anatomy, as his own peculiar system.

In a writer so loose and shadowy, it is difficult to find any brief and distinct statements, but the following passages present the general view of the author: "All living matter is capable of assuming every possible viable form of existence, *that form varying merely in accordance with the nature of the media it then inhabits*—in short, with the essential conditions of its existence." p. 121. "One thing is certain; it is the unity of the human family as a group of animal life; specific; with forms still human." p. 145. "Certain varieties, then, in human form, are produced by the law of unity of the organization; for every individual living form grows up influenced, regulated by two contending principles. The law of unity of the organization, ever present, ever active, ever ready to retain the embryonic forms." "The law of individuality of species—of speculization, leading to the perfection of the individual." p. 33.

In the London Lancet, the author speaks more definitely: "The embryo of any species of any natural family contains within it, during its phases of development, all the forms or species which that natural family can assume, or has assumed in past time." "The same, I believe, holds in man; so that were all the existing species of any family to be accidentally

destroyed, saving one, in the embryos and young of that one will be found the elements of all the species ready to reappear, to repeople the waters and the earth, the forms they are to assume being dependent on, therefore determined by the existing order of things." "As of fishes, so of man: one natural family—one embryonic form, equal to the production of all species in accordance with the essential conditions of existence in time and space." "The Negro, the Saab, the Mongol, are not the descendants of each other, nor of the white races, nor *vice versa*: they are forms of development of species from individuals, each possessing within them the elementary forms of all the species of the natural family to which they belong. All that is required for their appearance on earth, is the geographical, and, above all, the geological conditions under which they can exist. When these are found, the region becomes what is called a center of creation, from which the forms spread, under the limitations which Nature prescribes to herself."

Extracts to the same effect might be multiplied indefinitely, for this is the peculiar and labored doctrine of the essays. But that doctrine is almost identical with the statements of Hippocrates, so contemptuously rejected. The principal difference will be found in the Theism of the ancient, and the Atheism of the modern philosopher. Dr. Knox assures us that the French Revolution first completely emancipated the human mind, and gave opportunity for the development of his profoundly scientific revelations. Yet these revelations, so boastfully paraded, amount to nothing more than the simple formula announced by a great mind in the very birth time of human science. Air, Water, and Place, of Hippocrates, correspond very perfectly with "the geographical and geological conditions" of Dr. Knox. One scientific formula Dr. Knox can claim as an advance upon the philosophy of his great Predecessor. "The living zoological world, as it now exists, and has existed, is a *self-created, self-creating* world." *Lancet*, Vol. II: p. 460. The Dr. may, if he pleases, credit this proposition to "the French Revolution—that mightiest of all human events."

Let us see another example of the way in which philosophy, when it argues against God, falls into self-contradiction. Dr. Knox, in his first book, lays down the proposition as certain, that "no new species has arisen since the historic period." p. 264. In the *London Lancet*, he states the like position of Cuvier, and says, "Hence the law of fixity of species was forced upon him. After the most deliberate reflection, I adhere to the same view—namely, the inconvertibility of species into each other by any physical laws now in operation." p. 274.

But in the same work he declares that "Species is the product of external circumstances, acting through millions of years." p. 391. And by the same indefinite agency of "millions of years," he attempts to make out "the highest generalization," that "life is one, not many," and that the most complex form of animal life has evolved itself from the simplest. Here is philosophy to be admired. It first establishes a proposition as the certain result of all the known facts in known time; and then infers a proposition precisely opposite as the result of the same facts in unknown and conjectural time! If there were no facts at all upon the subject, the latter proposition would be a mere conjecture, fit only for the amusement of dreaming sciolists. But when the facts are so well known as to be referred by these very persons to a law—the inconvertibility of species in known time—the assertion of the unlimited formation and transformation of species in unknown time, is not only gratuitous, is not merely a conjecture, but it is a gross insult to the human understanding. The only conclusion which these gentlemen had a right to draw from their premises is, that the law of fixity of species prevailed in the unknown past, as it has done in the known historic period. Instead of this, they depart from their premises and assure us that "millions of years" will reverse the operations of thousands of years, and will account for all the actual phenomena of existence, without having recourse to the superstition of "final causes," or of a First Cause! "The doctrine of first cause, first distinctly formulated by Socrates, afterwards by Philo-Judaus, and pushed to its utmost extent by Paley, or at least by the Dutch writer, whom he is said to have pirated, had so firmly taken possession of all minds, that the adoption of any more philosophic view, seemed, at least in England, impossible. In Germany it was otherwise." London Lancet, Vol. II, p. 388.

The so-called Transcendental Anatomy, upon which Knox so boastingly bases his system of zoology, furnishes a remarkable instance of the way in which certain persons try to *diabolize* every new discovery, or supposed discovery of science, by exclaiming, there, now, your God is demolished, your religion is absurd, it is refuted by the laws of nature.

The principle of the Transcendental Anatomy is simply this—"All animals are formed upon one great plan." Knox on the races, p. 117. "Unity of plan, Unity of design, observable, traceable, demonstrable, in all forms which live, which have lived, or which may hereafter come into being." London Lancet, Vol. II, p. 383.

What has unity of organization, unity of plan, to do with

the denial of a Creator, or of one or more creations? Unity of plan, instead of leading us to blind nature for its origin, conducts us to an all-seeing God—to the One Mind which conceived at one instant all possible relations and dependencies. Transcendental Anatomy, therefore, if true, will furnish another excellent chapter for the works on natural Theology. Dr. Knox fancies that he has abolished the superstition of a Creator when he announces—"All living matter is capable of assuming every possible viable form of existence, that form varying merely in accordance with the nature of the media it then inhabits—in short, with the essential conditions of its existence." But whence came this capacity of living matter, and the correspondence between this capacity and external circumstances? It is a law of Nature, says the Dr. That law is impressed upon the living matter and upon the external circumstances by which it is modified, and made to assume the almost infinite variety of forms that exist. Where did this law come from? Who gave it, and impressed it upon dead and living matter? The Theist gives a satisfactory and rational answer to this question. The man of pseudo-science gives no answer; but prates about nature, the eternity of matter, and the superstition of believing in a First Cause.

With the true and rational answer to this momentous question, no theories of life and organization, no systems of geology or physiology, nor any department of human science, can have anything to do, *except to lead the mind inevitably up to the question, and to the all-sufficient answer.* These theories and systems, and all human science, lie in a sphere below that question and answer. They may appear, disappear, reappear, and vary indefinitely, yet they have introduced the sublime knowledge of God which nature and Christianity teach.

Applying the Transcendental Anatomy—the unity of organization—only to the "family of man," as Dr. Knox professes to do in his last work, and we have precisely the conclusion to which we came in the previous part of this Article. The conclusion which we hold in common with Dr. Knox is, that the human family is a unit, modified into permanent varieties by a law, that law operating in combination with external circumstances, and adapting each variety of the family to those circumstances. As rational Theists we hold further, in opposition to brute Atheism, that the law, and man and its subject, and the circumstances of his being, and the adaptation of one to the other, proceed from a Being All Wise and All Powerful—the CREATOR of all.

The profoundest philosophy leads inevitably to the devout

conclusion of the Psalmist—"I will give thanks unto THEE, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: Marvelous are thy works, and that my soul knoweth right well. Thine eyes did see my substance yet being imperfect: and in thy book were all my members written; Which day by day were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them."

On the important subject discussed in the foregoing Article, a learned friend hands us the following authorities, which we give in the form of an Appendix.—ED. CH. REVIEW.

The Unity of the Race is becoming more and more an interesting topic of inquiry, and there is an impression in the community that naturalists generally have come to a conclusion unfavorable to such unity. This impression is incorrect. Our most distinguished naturalists and ethnologists, down to the present time, either favor the unity or express themselves with great caution and modesty on the subject. I propose to collect some of their testimony for the last twenty years.

I commence with WILHELM VON HUMBOLDT, (b. 1767, d. 1836,) a man whom, it is said, every German is proud to name, as quoted by his brother in the *Kosmos*.

"The separate mythical traditions found to exist independently of one another, in different parts of the earth, appear to refute the hypothesis of an original gregarious condition of mankind, and they concur in ascribing the generations of the whole human race to the union of one pair.

"The general prevalence of this myth, has caused it to be regarded as a 'traditionary record transmitted from the primitive man to his descendants.'"

The testimony of ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT, the living Nestor of Physical Science, is found in his *Kosmos*, published in 1845.

"So long as attention was directed solely to the extremes in varieties of color and of form, and to the vividness of the first impression of the senses, the observer was naturally disposed to regard races rather as originally distinct species than as varieties. In my opinion, however, more powerful reasons can be advanced in favor of the unity of the human race.

"By maintaining the unity of the human species, we, at the same time, repel the *cheerless* assumption of superior and inferior races of men." See Sabine's *Cosmos*, I, 352, 355.

Let the reader observe the word *cheerless*, and he will perceive that Humboldt has the heart of a man.

The title of a work published by ARTHUR JAMES JOHNES, *Philological Proofs of the Original Unity and Recent Origin of the Human Race*, Lond., 1846, speaks for itself.

Dr. JAMES C. PRICHARD, (b. 1786, d. 1848,) the greatest writer who has treated of the science of ethnology, gives his last testimony in his *Report to the British Association for the Promotion of Science*, June, 1847.

"I may venture to remark, that with the increase of knowledge in every direction, we find continually less and less reason for believing that the diversified races of men are separated from each other by insurmountable barriers."

To which Dr. Prichard annexed in a note—

"It is with much gratification that I find this to be the ultimate conviction of the great author of *Kosmos*."

An Obituary of Dr. Prichard, by Dr. Thomas Hodgkin, read before the London Ethnological Society, Feb., 1849, contains two interesting paragraphs:

"I have understood that the young ethnologist maintained a correspondence with his father on the subject of his investigations, and that the good man not only took a lively interest in the inquiry, but expressed his desire that his son would maintain the orthodox side of the question with respect to the unity of our race. Judging from the uniform tenor of Dr. Prichard's mind, I am induced to believe that to this side his own views were always disposed to incline, although he has collected and stated the arguments on both sides with perfect fairness and impartiality.

"It may seem rather paradoxical, yet I cannot withhold the observation, that this bias is more favorable to the attainment of the true solution of the question, than the opposite tendency, and a readiness to admit independence of origin in several distinct pairs. This last assumption, by affording a ready explanation of the several varieties of form, color, and stature, must tend to damp the ardor of research; whereas the desire to discover the proofs of connection, in spite of these diversities, is like a lantern to our path in the obscurity of night; whilst the objections of opponents, whether urged or anticipated, must ever be ready to recall erring steps, where any deviation is made from the path of truth."

In the same Obituary, Dr. HODGKIN expresses his own opinion:

"Having myself paid some attention to the ethnological grouping of human skulls, I must confess that I have found very considerable difficulty in adopting points of characteristic difference, and in this very difficulty I find an argument in favor of the unity of our species, and of the differences we observe being those of variety only."

D. ERNEST DIEFENBACH, in *Journ. Ethnol. Soc.*, Vol. I, p. 17, Lond., 1848, shows himself a follower of Humboldt:

"We may be able to collect the colors of the prism, each of them rich and beautiful, into the pure ray of light, and confirm by inductive science the *cherished* unity of mankind."

"If anything can confirm the unity of mankind, and can bring it home to the most sceptic mind, it will be, when, by a thorough study of all the languages of the globe, we can prove them to be merely dialects, and derivations, from one and the same source."

THOMAS SMYTHE, D. D., of Charleston, S. C., in his *Unity of the Human Races*, New York, 1850:

"The unity of the races is proved from the universality, nature, and connection of languages."

WM. J. HAMILTON, D. D., of Mobile, Ala., in his *Friend of Moses*, New York, 1852, p. 482:

"Reason, tradition, and the Mosaic record do, then, all combine to assure us, all men, of all the different races now existing, have originated from one primitive pair."

MAX MULLER writes thus to Chevalier Bunsen, Aug. 1853:

"Physiological Ethnology has accounted for the varieties of the human race, and removed the barriers which formerly prevented us from viewing all mankind as the members of one family, the offspring of one parent."

"Such visions will float through the study of the grammarian, and in the midst of toilsome researches his heart will suddenly beat, as he feels the conviction growing upon him that men are brethren in the simplest sense of the word—the children of the same father—whatever their country, their color, their language, and their faith." See Bunsen's *Christianity and Mankind*, Vol. III, p. 474, 486. Lond. 1854.

Chevalier CHR. CHS. J. BUNSEN, in his *Report to the British Association*, June, 1847:

"Physiological inquiry inclines, on the whole, towards the theory of the unity of the race;" and "philological inquiry tends more and more to the same result."

"A high religious faith and a low philosophy of human nature must drive a thinking and honest mind, if not into despair and madness, into comfortless, chilling indifference and stupor."

Sir B. C. BRODIE, President of London Ethnological Society, in his Address before the Society, May, 1853:

"It is, however, satisfactory to find that the inquiries of the Ethnologist, so far from being opposed to, actually offer a strong confirmation

of the Mosaic records as to the origin of mankind from one parent stock, and not from different creations."

"Many facts lead us to believe in the unity of the race."

RICHARD CULL, Honorary Secretary of the London Ethnological Society since its first institution, assumes the unity of the race in his Annual Report to the Society of the progress of Ethnology:

"Our knowledge of human hybridism, if there be such a thing, is still more limited; and we cannot hastily assume, that what is true of the lower animals is also of man, and thus, by an assumed analogy, speak with dogmatism of the genera and species of mankind."

Dr. ROBERT GORDON LATHAM, the well known philologist, who has written *The Natural History of the Varieties of Man*, and *Man and his Migrations*, Lond. 1851, holds also to the unity of the Human Race.

Most of these authors are still living, and wrote with a knowledge of the facts of the case before them.

ART. V.—REV. DR. TURNER'S LETTER ON THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHURCH REVIEW :

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

It is with reluctance that I trouble you with this communication, the subject of which, however, presents, I think, a very sufficient reason for requesting its admission into your Periodical.

The last number of the *Church Review* contains some strictures on the edition of the Bible lately issued by the American Bible Society. They may be found on p. 422. As the Episcopal member of the Committee on Versions, under whose supervision the edition was prepared, I feel it my duty not to suffer them to pass unnoticed. It is not my intention to vindicate the right or propriety or expediency of Episcopalians uniting with other Christian bodies in associations formed for the purpose of disseminating the Sacred Scriptures, which they in common with such bodies regard as the word of God, and the rule of their faith. While many of our most honored Bishops belong to such institutions, and while we can appeal to the fact that WILLIAM WHITE, the venerated name which all sorts of Church people profess to hold in highest esteem, was the distinguished President of a General Bible Society, any such vindication would be, to say the least, a very strange work of supererogation. I say little about the charge against the Society of "consenting to take bribes from the revilers of Christ's divinity and atonement," simply because it presumes a degree of moral turpitude, to prove the existence of which, would require not merely ordinary evidence but the strongest demonstration. The writer has not stated the supposed facts on which he bases this very foul charge. Even supposing them to be just such as he presumes; supposing, too, that "the revilers" have offered the bribes; it still charges on the Society the intended and deliberate criminality of "consenting to take them." Of course I would not so degrade myself or the American Bible Society—which I regard as among the very noblest associations for good which our common country may be proud of—as to vindicate the Institution from such a charge. Rather than accuse your correspondent of so shocking an intention as his language necessarily implies, I am willing to presume that inadvertently and hastily he wrote what his cool and deliberate judgment would greatly modify, if not entirely withdraw. But the ex-

travagance of the charge against a numerous body of men of the very highest respectability for religious, literary, practical and useful character, must compel every dispassionate reader of the article to take the subsequent statements with due allowance, and that is, to say the least, very great indeed. It is reasonable to suppose *a priori* that the unchastened propensity to censure the Society which is developed in this gross attack, has had no slight influence in shaping the statements that follow. The writer does not seem to have considered that such an introduction goes very far to weaken, if not to destroy, the influence of all he says; at least with persons whose prepossessions have not placed them beyond the reach of argument.

Your contributor makes inconsistent statements. He says that "the proposed Standard is no longer the English version at all." Yet in the very next sentence he grants that "the professed improvements in the text are comparatively few, and may be regarded as slight." How is it possible to reconcile these two contradictory assertions? The text and the version are identically the same. The changes therein are "comparatively few, and may be regarded as slight," and yet they make the book "no longer the English version at all!" Truly it passes my skill in interpretation to reconcile such a glaring inconsistency as this. It is to no purpose to say what immediately follows, that "the professed improvements introduce a principle which, *if carried further*, would destroy the book as a genuine English Bible." The question is not what might be true under certain circumstances, but what *the fact is with regard to this edition*, which he affirms is "no longer the English version. Moreover, he should have told us what a genuine English Bible is, establishing at the same time the correctness of his description. *Explain terms* is a good old rule, which every writer would do well to keep in view.

As I wish the reader of these remarks to have the charges distinctly in his mind, I must here quote at large. "When a Society whose endowments were received on a compact to print and publish a recognized work, becomes a Society for criticising and reëditing and improving that work, it is our business to beware of it, and to ask the question whether such depositaries of a worldly trust, are safe guardians of the sacred oracles. I say further, that the secret managers of the Institution, whoever they may be, are very greatly to be blamed for their abuse of the confidence so blindly reposed in them. While professing to give our countrymen the English Bible, 'without note or comment,' they have, in fact, become commentators in a dangerous form, and have corrupted the work they profess to pub-

lish, by the introduction of unauthorized *headings*, of which some are grossly unevangelical, while others are virtually anti-Christian. This assertion I am prepared to sustain more fully," &c. The writer talks of sustaining his assertion *more fully*. MORE FULLY! He has not attempted to sustain it *at all*. He has made assertions, and nothing else.

He charges the Society with a breach of promise, with such a failure in the matter of a solemn contract as would stamp disgrace on merely business men who profess no religious character. He speaks of *secret* management, though everything in relation to the institution lies open to the public, and a history of the procedure in regard to the very edition so calumniated has been published to the world. Does the author know what the Society pledged itself to do? I presume not, and should be sorry to think otherwise. The first article of the Constitution which was formed in May, 1816, sufficiently speaks for itself. It is as follows:—"This Society shall be known by the name of the American Bible Society, of which the sole object shall be to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment. The only copies in the English language to be circulated by the Society shall be of the version now in common use;" that is, what is generally known as King James' Bible. The Society does not promise to reprint any particular edition of this version, with a particular set of headings, marginal notes, references, &c. Its contract is limited to the version, in other words, to the text itself. This article of the constitution was formed at a time when numerous editions of the version were in circulation; some with various headings, various references, various punctuations and capital letters, and some with no headings or references at all. And this practice had prevailed not only in this country, but also in England. In all these respects editions differed. No charge of aberration from authority was ever made against these or subsequent similar editions. All were accepted by the Christian community as "*the version in common use*." This settles the principle, that headings are not of the essence of the version, and may be changed without affecting it or the original pledge of the Society. And the history of the publications of King James' version shows that this has often been done.

The writer applies the epithet *authorized* to the *headings*. There is more reason to apply it to *marginal readings* and *notes*, and just as much to make it comprehend *references*, *punctuation*, *capital letters*, *spelling*, &c. It is easy to speak of all these as *authorized*, but what edition of the Bible is for the Christian community the authoritative standard on these points?

The answer is, *no one*, and therefore the author's statements are simply a *begging of the question*, and of no weight at all as argument. If it should be said that a large proportion of the headings in the leading editions are in substance the same as those of the original one of 1611, and that they have become authorized by length of time, it may be replied, that a continuous repetition does not give them authority—that the best of the later editions which have been generally received in the Church of England, among which Blayney's of 1769 may be named as prominent, have altered in many cases, which proves that the respectable editors recognized no such principle of authority—and lastly, that a large proportion of the original headings are retained unaltered in the edition lately published by the Society. This edition, which the author complains of, has not altered "the genuine old English Bible," except, in the mode of spelling a few words, in the occasional use of capital letters and of the articles *a* or *an*, in the insertion of a few italics when the original contains nothing correspondent, and sometimes in the punctuation. And in every case, the committee thought that a good reason for the change could be given.

It would extend this Article to an undue length, were I to enter very much into details respecting these various particulars. But the subject demands a few words. In the spelling, the most important alterations are those of two proper names. In Rom. ix, 25, the old name *Osee* is changed into *Hosea*, and in Jude, ver. 11, *Core* into *Korah*. I was not particularly desirous of these changes, but willingly acquiesced in them, because they produce uniformity and make the words more intelligible to uninformed readers or hearers. The others are not so great as had been before introduced into all important editions, not one of which, for the last 150 years, to the best of my knowledge, follows the spelling of the original edition. The use of capitals and of punctuation necessarily involves somewhat of comment, and indeed so do also the division into chapters and verses, and even the subdividing into words, between which some early manuscripts leave no space. Yet, I suppose, that no intelligent man will question the propriety of all this, and certainly no honest one will say that such points were intended by the language of the constitution, "without note or comment." When the word *spirit* occurs, its meaning *must* be intimated, unless indeed it is always printed with a capital or always without one.* And it is impossible to punctuate such

* The use of a small letter in the word "spirits," in Rev. i, 4, has been objected to. See particularly the note in the Translation of this Book issued by the American Bible Union, 1854, p. 79. "The American Bible Society now

places as Matt. xix, 28, and Heb. x, 12, without suggesting something of an explanation. In many cases the committee would not alter the commonly received punctuation, because they did not choose to introduce, solely on their own judgment, what they nevertheless believed to be an improvement. The same remark applies to not a few marginal notes; of the latter I will refer to two instances. In Num. xxiv, 20, the text reads thus: "Amalek *was* the first of the nations." The marginal note is as follows: "Or, *the first of the nations* that warred against Israel, Ex. 17, 8." Here the words not in italics* are comment; very ancient, indeed, for it appears in the Chaldee Targum of Onkelos, but wholly unfounded. So also in Isa. xl, 9, the translation is, "O Zion—O Jerusalem that bringest good tidings." In the margin the reading is, "*O thou that tellest good tidings to Zion*, ch. 41, 27, and 52, 7;" and, immediately afterwards, "*to Jerusalem.*" The Hebrew will not bear the marginal change, and the two passages referred to are not apposite, because the form in the original is different. Yet these are left untouched, simply because they appear in the original edition of 1611, which in this respect the Committee did not feel themselves authorized to alter in accordance with their own conviction of the meaning.

I have reserved the topic of *headings* for more particular consideration, because especial importance seems to be attached to them, and they are made the subject of marked censure. "Some are grossly unevangelical, others virtually anti-Christian." Without pretending to have in memory all the headings which are peculiar to this edition, I do not hesitate to express my belief—founded upon a familiar acquaintance with many of them, and a confidence in the evangelical and Christian character of those members of the Committee who chiefly devoted themselves to

prints this word *spirits*, (without a capital,) as the result of the Society's application of the following rule: 'The word *Spirit* . . . everywhere is made to begin with a capital when it refers to the Spirit of God as a divine agent; but not when it denotes other spiritual beings or the spirit of man.' My belief is that the Society's interpretation of the term in the present instance is erroneous, though it agrees with Robinson's, and that it weakens and darkens the sublimest formula of benediction to be found in Scripture." Now it appears to me that the Society has avoided giving any interpretation at all. Its rule, which is a general one, does not provide for a case so peculiar as this, unless indeed its language be freely interpreted. If a capital letter had been employed, it might have afforded plausible ground for the objection, that seven Spirits of God are recognized as divine agents. The use of a small letter does not imply a denial that the whole phrase conveys the idea of the Holy Spirit, but only that the word "*spirits*" alone does not. And that is true. Let it be noted that the original edition of 1611 prints this word with a small *a*. The Society's standard does but follow it.

* In the edition of 1611 they are in italics as well as the words that precede them.

this department—that this charge cannot be sustained. It is hardly necessary to suggest to any intelligent person that an omission of some evangelical and Christian sentiment is no proof of a want of evangelism, much less of opposition to what is Christian. If so, the charge would apply to the Book of Esther and the Epistle of St. James. And yet, I doubt whether the writer has anything else to found his very grave accusation on than barely such omissions, and the substitution of other headings in their place.* Instead of “becoming commentators in a dangerous form,” as he says, or indeed in any form whatever, the leading principle which governed the Committee in the article of headings was to avoid, so far as was possible, all comment. With this view they frequently altered headings, with the sentiments of which they entirely accorded, because they were decided commentary, and substituted others, which no candid man can so represent, for this plain reason, that they are taken from the very words of the text itself. In many cases, the headings in the original edition of 1611 seem to have been made on the same principle. Two or three illustrations will be sufficient—“Gen. iii, 14, The serpent is cursed; 15, The promised seed. Num. xxiv, 15, He prophesieth of the star of Jacob. 2 Sam. vii, 12, He promiseth him benefittes and blessings in his seede. Isa. xi, 1, The peaceable kingdom of the Branch out of the root of Jesse.” In other cases they were evidently prepared with a view to exposition. Thus in Isa. xl, 1-10: “The promulgation of the Gospel, the preaching of John the Baptist, the preaching of the Apostles.” To the same purpose, Blayney. The heading in the lately published edition is as follows: “God’s command to comfort his people. 3, An exhortation to prepare the way of the Lord. 9, And to proclaim the glad tidings of his coming.” This is drawn from the text itself, and it allows—what is necessary to a fair interpretation of the portion—a reference to the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity and their re-settlement in their own land, and also the return of mankind to God by means of the Gospel of His Son. The old heading ignores the former view entirely, though it is as much the prophet’s meaning as the latter. *Ab uno disce omnia.* On the same principle, the word *Christ* in the Psalms and Prophets is altered into *Messiah*, and *Church*, as occasion required, into *the people of God*, or *Zion*, or *Israel*. In the Song of Solomon, the words *bridegroom*

* After preparing this reply, I saw a note from the author of the Article in the Church Review, written in defense of his charge, which proves the correctness of what is above stated.

and *bride* are introduced, being the terms employed by the author himself. No intelligent reader needs to be informed that *Messiah* in Hebrew and *Christ* in Greek mean the same thing, namely, *Anointed*, and consequently either equally expresses the royal, prophetic and priestly character of our Lord. It has been objected to the introduction of the Hebrew term in the Old Testament that it accommodates to Jewish expression. This is worthy of note, as it shows how utterly devoid of argument the objection is, and for the same reason it is unworthy of any attempt at confutation. The other terms are frequently used in the Bible to denote God's Church. The words selected as prominent in the headings of Solomon's Song, are the most endearing descriptions of Christ and his Church to be found within the compass of Scripture. And yet it has been said that the adoption of them in the Standard Edition shows that the book was regarded as a mere epithalamium. Such illogical conclusions are quite in character with the animus which allows a writer to stigmatize the edition as a CORRUPT AND DANGEROUS COMMENTARY, UNEVANGELICAL AND ANTI-CHRISTIAN!

For further information in regard to the character of the headings in the American Bible Society's standard,* compared with those in some former editions, I will now submit to the reader a few instances, leaving him to form his own judgment on the point of preference. I confine the comparison to the original edition of 1611, to Blayney's of 1769, and to the Edinburg of 1845, which was used in its collation. It will be seen that the idea of any set of headings having been authorized so as to preclude alteration, never seems to have been thought of. Gen. iii. Here the editions of 1611 and 1856 agree. Blayney's differs somewhat: 6, Man's fall. 14, The serpent is cursed, and his overthrow by the seed of the woman foretold. 22, Their expulsion out of Paradise. The Edinburg is as follows: 6, Man's fall. 14, The serpent is cursed; his overthrow by the woman's seed. 16, Mankind; punishment; and loss of Paradise.

ix. 1611: God Blesseth Noah. 4, Blood and murder are forbidden. 18, Noah replenisheth the world. 21, Is drunken and mocked of his sonne. 25, Curseth Canaan. 26, Blesseth Shem. 27, Prayeth for Japheth. Blayney: God blesseth Noah, granting him animal food, but forbidding the eating of blood, and murder. 18, The earth is re-peopled from Noah. 20, He planteth a vineyard, is drunken, and mocked by Canaan, whom he curseth, and blesseth his other sons. The Edinburg: God

* Imperial quarto of 1856.

blesseth Noah. 4, Blood and murder are forbidden. 8, God's covenant. 13, Signified by the rainbow. 23, Noah is drunken, and mocked by Ham. 26, He blesseth. 29, He dieth. 1856: God blesseth Noah. 4, Murder and the eating of blood are forbidden. 8, God's covenant with Noah. 13, The rainbow a token thereof. 18, The sons of Noah. 20, He planteth a vineyard, is drunken and mocked by Ham. 25, He curseth Canaan. 26, Blesseth Shem and Japheth. 29, And dieth.

xxii. 1611: Abraham is tempted to offer Isaac. 13, Isaac is exchanged with a ramme. Blayney: 11, The angel stayeth him from slaying his son, in whose stead he offereth a ram. The Edinburg: Abraham offering Isaac, 11, is stayed by an Angel. 20, The generation of Nahor with Rebekeh. 1856: Abraham commanded to offer up Isaac. 3, His faith and obedience. 11, The Angel of the Lord stayeth him. 13, A ram is sacrificed instead of Isaac. 14, The place is called Jehovah-jireh. 15, Abraham is blessed again. 20, The children of Nahor. The reader will not fail to observe that this is the only one of the four editions which gives a full view of the chapter.

Deut. xviii, 15. 1611: Christ the prophet is to be heard. Blayney: A prophet to arise like unto Moses, who must be hearkened unto. 1856: A prophet is promised to Israel.

Job xix, 23. 1611: He believeth the resurrection. Blayney and the Edinburg: He professeth his belief of a future resurrection. 1856: He is confident that God will yet vindicate his cause. In this case the original heading might well have been retained, at least in substance. It not only expresses a very old opinion, but one which I believe gives a correct view of the text, such as I stated 29 years ago in a note in Jahn's Introduction, pp. 469, 470. The heading in the late edition, however, does not deny this sense, as Job's future resurrection would effectually vindicate his cause. But neither does it affirm it, as do the two preceding editions. It leaves the reader free to form his own judgment, which, whether it be in favor of or against the opinion, may find distinguished names both of ancient and modern times to defend it. It is worthy of note that while the English copies commence the word *Redeemer* in verse 25 with a small letter, the American employs a capital.

Psalms xvi, xxii, xl, lxix. In all these Psalms and also in others, the editions of 1611 and Blayney represent David as the speaker. David complaineth—Hee prayeth—Hee praiseth God:—Obedience is the best sacrifice—The sense of David's evils, &c. Thus all ultimate reference to Christ is excluded, although this is inconsistent with numerous quotations in the New Testament. The edition of 1856 employs the word

Psalmist, which is applicable to the speaker, and does not identify the subject of the Psalm with the writer. Thus it leaves the reader free to understand them of the Messiah.

Song of Solomon: The most considerable changes have been made in the headings of the chapters of this book. In the older editions these are direct and positive commentary, affixing interpretations which limit the meaning to Christ and the Church. For example: v, 9. A description of Christ by his graces; vi. 4. Christ sheweth the graces of the Church; vii, 1. A further description of the Church her graces; viii, 8, The calling of the Gentiles. Blayney repeats these headings. The edition of 1856 avoids all attempt to explain, by selecting its headings from the text itself. One example must suffice: viii. The delight of the bride and her beloved in each other. 6, Love strong as death. 8, The bride's desire in behalf of her sister. 14, She longeth for the coming of her beloved.

From the prophet Isaiah one or two passages have already been given. It may be well, however, to add a few others. vii, 1611: 7, Ahaz hath for a signe Christ promised. Blayney: Christ is promised for a sign. 1856: 10, Ahaz refuseth to ask a sign. 14, The Lord promiseth Immanuel. liii. 1611: The prophet complaining of incredulitie, excuseth the scandall of the crosse. 4, By the benefitte of his passion. 10, And the good successe thereof. (The reader will do well to consider what is the meaning of this.) Blayney altered the heading thus: The prophet complaining of want of faith, describeth the humiliation of Christ; 4, His suffering; 10, And the good success thereof. This is certainly an improvement. The Edinburg coincides with Blayney as far as the word *faith*, adding: and then excuseth the scandal of the cross, 4, by the suffering of Christ. The edition of 1856 has as follows: The Messiah despised and rejected. 4, His sufferings in our behalf. 7, His meekness, humiliation, and death. 10, The benefits of His passion.

lv. 1611: The prophet with the promises of Christ calleth to faith, 6, and to repentance. 8, The happy successe of them that believe. Blayney: The prophet with the free offers of grace through Christ, exhorteth to faith, 6, and to repentance. 8, The happy state of believers. The Edinburg follows the edition of 1611 in the first sentence, and Blayney in the second. 1856: A gracious invitation to accept God's abundant mercy in the Messiah. 10, God's word shall prosper.

lxi. 1611: The office of Christ. 4, The forwardnesse, 7, and blessings of the faithfull. Blayney on ver. 1, the same. 4, The restoration and blessedness of the Church. The Edinburg is

the same as Blayney with the omission of *and blessedness*. 1856 : The office of the Messiah. 4, The glorious results of his coming.

lxiii. 1611 : 1, Christ showeth who he is, 2, what his victory over his enemies, 7, and what his mercy toward his Church. 10, In his just wrath he remembereth his free mercy. Blayney : Christ showeth his power to save, and his vengeance upon his enemies. 7, A thankful commemoration of God's old loving kindnesses to his people. The Edinburg omits Blayney's second clause, and substitutes *remembrance* for *commemoration*. 1856 : The Messiah's triumph over the enemies of Zion. 7, A song of thanksgiving to God for his goodness to Israel. 15, The prayer of his people in their affliction.

lxvi. 1611 : 19, The Gentiles shall have an holy Church, 24, and see the damnation of the wicked. Blayney : 18, The gathering of the believing Jews and Gentiles into one Church, where they shall together worship God, and see the damnation of the wicked. Instead of the last clause the Edinburg has : God's severe judgments on the wicked. 1856 : 19, The message of salvation to be sent to all nations, and the fruits thereof. 24, The fearful end of transgressors.

Jeremiah. 1611 : xxiii. 5, Christ shall rule and save them. Blayney : Christ the righteous branch is promised. 1856 : 5, Predictions concerning the Messiah.

In Daniel, and also generally in the minor Prophets the edition of 1611 attempts no exposition, not even in Dan. ix, 20, which is the same as that of 1856. Blayney introduces there these words : Gabriel informeth him of the seventy weeks, and of the time and death of the Messiah, and of the succeeding troubles. In ii, 14, the original edition has : Daniel findeth the dream. Blayney, who is followed in the late edition, improves : The dream is revealed to him. To the same purpose the Edinburg.

I have selected the above headings because they relate to important portions of the Old Testament. They are, as I believe, a fair specimen, and give the reader an opportunity to judge for himself, whether the abuse contained in the statements of the Church Review has any reasonable ground. Do these and other similar alterations justify the charge of offering a lure to *the revilers of Christ's divinity and atonement*, of *vitiating the English Bible*, of *abusing confidence*, of *corrupting the work*, of *introducing GROSSLY unevangelical and virtually anti-Christian headings* ? The accuser, in the fullness of his anti-American Bible Society bias, has not allowed himself to think the matter over with due calmness and deliberation, and inconsiderately, as I would fain hope, has published to the world what is in itself untrue.

The "Report of the History and recent collation of the English version of the Bible," which was "presented by the Committee on Versions to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society, and adopted May 1, 1851," and was afterwards published, contains a collection of headings, an examination of which may enable the reader to judge of the expediency of making some changes. See pp. 27, 28. I quote one or two, and add also a few more of portions which are not of especial importance, merely to show more fully how the most respectable editions vary from each other, and from the original of 1611.

1 Sam. xvi. 1611: Samuel sent by God, under pretense of a sacrifice, cometh to Bethlehem. Blayney: Samuel at God's direction goeth to Bethlehem under pretense of a sacrifice. The Edinburg follows that of 1611. 1856: Samuel sent to Bethlehem to anoint one of the sons of Jesse. A thoughtful reader will ask himself whether it is allowable to represent the head of the Prophets as going to do one thing under pretense of another; and this by the command of God?

Ps. lxxii. 1611: David praying for Solomon, sheweth the goodness and glory of his, in type, and in truth, of Christ's kingdom. Blayney: David praying for Solomon sheweth the happiness, justice, and glory, of his reign, and of Christ's kingdom under that type. Edinburg: David sheweth the glory of Solomon's kingdom in type, and of Christ's in truth. 1856: The Psalmist praying for the King, foretelleth his prosperous and glorious reign.

cxlix. 1611: The Prophet exhorteth to praise God for his love to the church, 5, and for that power which hee hath given to the Church to rule the consciences of men. Such a heading may have been agreeable to persons high in authority in the time of the first of the Stuarts, but subsequently it was found expedient to alter it. Blayney and the Edinburg read after *given*, to his saints. 1856: The Psalmist exhorteth to praise God for his love to Zion, 5, and for that power which he hath given to the saints.

[Eccles. xii. 1611: The Creator is to be remembered in due time. 8, The Preacher's care to edifie. 13, The feare of God is the chiefe antidote of vanitie. Blayney: The first two sentences as in 1611; afterwards thus: 13, The general conclusion, that man's chief concern is to fear God and obey his laws. Edinburg: The Creator to be remembered in the days of youth, and must not be deferred. 13, The fear of God the chief concern of man. 1856: The young exhorted to remem-

ber their Creator. 10, The Preacher's care to edify. 13, The whole duty of man.]

Isa. xlv, 20. 1611: Hee convinceth the idoles of vanitie, by his saving power. Blayney: Idols convinced of vanity. The Edinburg omits any heading of the verse. 1856: The vanity of idols. li. 1611: An exhortation after the patterne of Abraham, to trust in Christ; 3, by reason of his comfortable promises; 4, of his righteous salvation; 7, and man's mortalitie; 9, Christ by his sanctified arme, defendeth his from the feare of man; 19, He bewaileth the afflictions of Jerusalem; 21, and promiseth deliverance. (An extraordinary heading, truly!) Blayney: The righteous are exhorted by the example of Abraham to trust in God, who will comfort his Church; 4, The certainty of his salvation; 7, The reproach of men should not be feared by the righteous; 9, A call upon God's arm to exert itself as of old in redeeming His Church; 12, The vanity of fearing man, and distrusting his Maker's power; 17, The Prophet bewaileth the afflictions of Jerusalem; 21, and promiseth deliverance. Edinburg: The righteous exhorted, after the pattern of Abraham, to trust in Christ; 4, The certainty of his salvation; 17, The Prophet bewaileth the afflictions of Jerusalem, &c. 1856: Comfort promised to Zion; 4, God's salvation is near; 7, The destruction of Zion's enemies foretold; 9, The people of God pray for his aid as of old; 12, His promise to them; 17, The afflictions of Jerusalem bewailed; 21, and her deliverance promised.

Lam. iii. 1611: The faithful bewaile their calamities; 22, By the mercies of God they nourish their hope; 37, They acknowledge God's justice; 55, They pray for deliverance; 64, and vengeance on their enemies. Blayney: The Prophet bewaileth his own calamities; 22, He acknowledgeth God's mercies and truth to be a proper ground of patient hope; 37, He maketh humble confession of the sins which had drawn down God's severe judgments; 55, He prayeth to be avenged of his enemies. Edinburg: The Prophet bewaileth his own calamities; 37, His humble confession of sins; 55, and prayer for deliverance. 1856: The first part agrees with the Edinburg; 21, He acknowledgeth the mercies of God; 37, His humble confession of sin; 55, He prayeth for deliverance; 64, and for recompense upon his enemies.

Dan. xi. 1611: 5, Leagues and conflicts betweene the kings of the South and of the North; 30, The invasion and tyrannie of the Romanes. Blayney: 21, The exploits of one of the latter princes; 30, who, being checked on his progress by the

ships of Chittim, shall turn his fury against the holy land; 36, An impious tyranny set up; 40, Events that shall take place in the latter times. The Edinburg follows 1611. 1856: 21, The rise of a vile person to power; 30, His impious conduct; 40, His fall.

Jonah i, 4. 1611: He is bewrayed by a tempest. Blayney: He is overtaken by a tempest and discovered. Edinburg: The ship is overtaken by a tempest. 1856: He is overtaken by a tempest.

Every reader who compares the headings of these different editions with each other, and with that of 1611, must admit the following results:

1. So far from uniformly following the original edition, Blayney and the Edinburg not only vary from it, but evidently intended to correct and improve it. Consequently they did not regard its headings as settled by authority, and unalterable, except by the same or equivalent authority.

2. They often vary from each other; and this proves that they recognized the right of altering what had been previously in use. Therefore, *in this respect*, they did not regard any edition as a standard not to be varied from.

3. Some of the older headings were of such a kind as to require alteration, and those substituted in the edition of 1856, are manifest improvements.

The marginal readings appended to the text in the original edition, are retained in that of 1856. See those of Num. xxiv, 20, and Isa. xl, 9, before stated. A few others have been added; as, for example, "Gr. *The passover*," in Acts xii, 4, where the text has "Easter."

I have said nothing respecting the references to other texts. In the early editions, these are very few. Later ones have multiplied them, beyond all reasonable bounds, adding in some cases, to those of its original edition, more than a hundred on a single chapter. I do not allude merely to Canne's celebrated reference Bible, but to editions, some of Oxford, generally received by the Church of England. Many, on the other hand, omit them all. Of course, they were never regarded as authoritative.

Had the author of the Article in the Church Review stated in the most decided terms his opinion of the inexpediency, and even impropriety of introducing alterations from any supposed authorized standard, I would not have troubled him or the Church with the publication of my own contrary opinion, since I freely grant the right of private judgment on all such matters, and the public expression of it. But when he makes the

introduction of such alterations an occasion of exposing to obloquy a most respectable body of men, a solemn sense of duty compels me to speak and to repel the charge. This I have now done. When I consider how carefully these abused headings were prepared, how they particularly avoid deciding what is uncertain, how conscientiously they appear to have been made with a single eye to truth; I must say, that I regard such unsupported attacks as those which have now been considered, as deserving of rebuke. It seems to be a case to which the divine precept applies, "Be ye angry, and sin not." Eph. iv, 26.

SAM'L H. TURNER,

GEN. THEOL. SEMINARY, November, 1856.

ART. VI.—THE LATE GENERAL CONVENTION.

Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, 1856. Together with the Constitution and Canons.

UNUSUAL pains were taken by the Secular and Religious press to spread before the Church full and accurate reports of the proceedings and debates of the late General Convention. All who desired information in regard to what was said and done, enjoyed the amplest means for securing it. This fact renders unnecessary, at this time and in these pages, any formal recapitulation or elaborate resumé of the proceedings. In what we have to say, we shall go upon the presumption that our readers are duly informed as to the details. Our object, then, is not to narrate or to compile, but so to study the more important topics and forms of legislation, as to catch and put on record, for the inspection of after years, a just impression of the prevailing temper and dominant purpose of the Triennial General Convention of 1856. For history tells us that such bodies survive longer in their power for good or evil, through the tone and spirit of their conferences, discussions, and enactments, than through any special results which they may originate by the processes of formal legislation.

It will not, we think, be deemed an extravagant pretension, if we claim for a Quarterly some peculiar advantages in an attempt of this character. While conceding to our Weeklies all those qualities which make them effective and influential—such as enterprise, promptness, and a certain quick and nimble facility in dealing with affairs as they rise—qualities finding expression in paragraphs and leaders, written *currente calamo*, and embodying, sometimes, of necessity, judgments and criticisms essentially extemporaneous; yet we may claim for an organ like this, the very great advantage of securing for the subjects it treats a graver handling, more mature convictions, and, on the whole, conclusions more truthful and impartial. This advantage may not always appear in these pages, but it enters largely into the public estimate of our resources and responsibilities.

The General Convention is composed of two Houses—the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. The House of Bishops consists of all the Bishops, Diocesan and

Missionary. Its sessions are strictly private, allowing the presence neither of reporters nor spectators. The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies consists of four clergymen and four laymen, chosen by each Diocese; numbering, all told, about two hundred and forty members. The sessions of this House, in token of its more popular character, are public. The course of legislation resembles that pursued in our Federal Congress. Both Houses must consent in order that any act may become a law; hence, each has an absolute veto upon the other. Whenever demanded by the deputies of any one Diocese, the vote on any question pending must be taken by orders; and to secure an effective majority, both orders must concur. The lay element, therefore, is practically just as potent as the clerical. Many analogies might be pointed out between this Body and the National Congress—so many, indeed, as to lead some to suppose that our spiritual fathers modeled, so far as practicable, the one after the other. It is well known that some of the guiding, controlling intellects in the formation of the one acted as advisers, at least, in the formation of the other. But to whatever extent, be it more or less, it was consciously attempted to conform the Supreme Legislative Body of this Communion to the Federal Legislature; there was one illustrious and memorable assembly which its framers had largely in their minds. We refer to the first Christian Council ever held—the Council of Jerusalem, over which the Apostle James presided—whose members, as Scripture declares, consisted of Apostles, Elders, and Brethren. Our fathers accordingly established a Council composed of Bishops, Presbyters, and Laymen.

It has been sometimes objected to the Episcopal Church that its government and discipline are too centralizing in their tendencies, that Bishops wield too much power, that their sphere of influence is dangerously large, and therefore that the very genius of the Church estranges it from the popular voice. The Protestant Episcopal Church is representative—republican; but not democratic. It is so in the sense that our civil organization is. Politically we are a republic, not a democracy. There are two ends which all proper Church government must keep in view: viz, efficiency of collective action and protection of the individual—in other words—thorough organization and security of private liberty. Now the first can be had only by a certain amount of centralization; the second can be had only by a corresponding amount of diffused power. The Church has happily provided for the accomplishment of both these ends by centralizing in the prerogatives of Bishops, and by diffusing in the franchises of the laity. In doing so, she has had a wise

reference in all cases to the quality and degree of power so conferred. Without dwelling upon this point, we may safely assert that notwithstanding the authority vested in Bishops and Presbyters, no communion in the land has given the laity so much substantial and practical power as our own. For ample proof of the fact we need not go beyond the constitution of this—the highest Council of the Church. The power thus granted to the laity is, in all its bearings, so influential as to demand the fullest guarantees that it will be safely exercised. The last and surest of these has, at length, been provided by an amendment to the Constitution enacted by the late General Convention, which requires every Lay delegate to the Convention to be a communicant, and not merely, as heretofore, a baptized member of the Church. This provision, so just in itself and so effectually protective of the Church against intrusions into her Councils of enemies under the guise of friends, will quiet the apprehensions of many of our brethren of the Mother Church, who have often expressed a well-founded surprise that we should grant to the Laity so much legislative power, without furnishing any adequate safeguards against its abuse by indifferentists and unbelievers.

The powers of the General Convention may be briefly defined. They are simply those which, by common consent, it is supposed can be more advantageously exercised by such a central body than by the several Dioceses. It has hitherto been the rule to interfere as little as possible with matters that could be better cared for by the several Diocesan Conventions; and to look to the General Convention only for such legislation as the whole Church alone was competent to enact and enforce. Thus each Diocese has its own local missions, its own provisions for Christian education, its own mode of regulating the affairs of Parishes, its own Annual Conventions; while to the General Triennial Council belongs the care of Foreign and Domestic Missions, of the Prayer-Book, as containing the Church's devotional system; and, briefly, of all the essentials and most of the accidents of doctrine, discipline, and worship.

Up to a certain point there is considerable similarity between General and Diocesan rights, powers, and functions in the Church, and Federal and State-rights and powers in our political system. But, after all, it is only a partial likeness—one which, when introduced as an argument for or against proposed changes in our Constitution, is productive of serious fallacies. For, in the formation of our Ecclesiastical system and of the Constitution which defines its powers, there was no such process as that witnessed in the formation of our national union. There was no covenanted cession of rights, no formal transfer

of power, no surrender of local sovereignty and independence by one party to the other. The Protestant Episcopal Church, therefore, is to be regarded not as made up of confederated Dioceses, each in itself originally separate and independent, but as a branch of the Church Catholic, having its existence in the body of its members and performing its functions of legislation and government coterminously through Councils, Diocesan and General.

As to the dignity, importance, and influence of the General Convention, it is hardly proper to pass them without a word. We are in no fear that they will be overestimated. Our fear is the other way. This Body appears too much like a creature of yesterday; its modes of procedure are too familiar; it deals with too many living and immediate issues, and is too much identified with the errors and infirmities necessarily incident to the conduct of its varied business, as well as to the zealous conflict of antagonistic plans and opinions, to be at all likely to become the object of undue reverence or extravagant admiration. We are apt to forget, while thinking of these vulgarizing associations, the mighty interests it handles and the solemn trusts it guards. We are prone to overlook its representative significance in the present, and its moulding power over the future. Occupied in criticising this or that measure to which its sanction has been given, pleased or displeased with this or that result of its deliberations, we fail to see how it periodically gathers in and reproduces in debate, or condenses into law, the diffused and slowly ripening sentiments of the Church; and thus, by its sessions, marks the steps backwards or forwards of our collective religious life.

In estimating the importance and dignity of this supreme Council, there may be some diversity of opinion as to the comparative rank of the sources whence they proceed. Some may dwell chiefly on its latent as well as manifested capacities for good, and some on its office as the gradual elaborator of a system of law and policy destined to spread over this continent. Some, again, may be attracted by the diversified talent, the grave and cultivated intelligence, the calm, conservative temper, and the ripe Christian experience which usually characterize its members; while others may be more profoundly impressed, by the educated and influential constituencies it represents, constituencies illustrious in every department of thought and activity, and wielding, to-day, in Society and the State, in Religion and Letters, a power out of all proportion to their numbers. As for ourselves, we are disposed to rest its claims upon the serious attention of the time, chiefly on the fact that it

is not only performing the responsible functions conferred by the Church in her best periods upon her national and provincial Councils; not only doing the work done by the synods of Rome, Carthage, and Antioch in the third century, or by those of Arles, Saragossa, and Milan in the fourth, or by those of Orleans and Toledo in the fifth; but doing the same work, discharging substantially the same duties, ministering to the same glorious ends, for a people and in a land and age like ours; all whose characteristics, whether of the brain, the heart, or the arm, are projected on a scale of grandeur unknown to any other period of the world's story. The work, in itself, is one of awful magnitude; but it fairly oppresses the judgment and the conscience when we reflect that it must be done among and for such huge masses of accountable life as are now leaving the old centers of civilization and seeking new homes and building new empires between these two oceans. Races, not individuals, are in motion; states, not villages and cities, are struggling to the birth. The most solemn and precious of the traditions of Christian humanity, are in the midst of an exodus from worn-out populations and decaying social fabrics into a land broad enough for the play of the world's forces, and a nation whose heart is young, whose sinews are fresh, and whose plans and hopes are even more magnificent than its capabilities of achievement are powerful and diversified.

But if this aspect of the case reveals broad views of the dignity and importance of our General Convention, there is still another fraught with a revelation yet more impressive and momentous. All these races that meet and commingle here—each bringing with it some homebred weakness or corruption, each defective in the training that qualifies for the safe exercise of political rights, each craving more or less exemption from salutary restraints; and each moreover grasping with covetous hand that lowest good of thinking natures—wealth which soonest breeds excess and pride; all these must be so fused into one as to draw their moral being from the same general sources, and to submit their wills to the same social bonds. Now it is well known that the religious element is at once the deepest and most energetic element in national life. It has more to do than any other with the formation of national character. Beyond any other it enfold the germ of a nation's future. In the work just spoken of it must act a more prominent part than it has ever done before. But this religious element is a variable force; the quality and direction of its influence depending greatly upon the form it assumes, the channels through which it operates, and the historical associations with

which it is identified. As experience shows it may lean toward superstition or rationalism, toward despotism or individualism. So far as it does either it must become the corrupter rather than the purifier of the sources of public life, and sap rather than brace the sanctions of national conscience. Hence it becomes a matter of the gravest import what type of Christianity shall supply to this Republic the needed religious element.

Now the Christian influence at work among us is divisible into three kinds—ultra-Protestantism, or the sect spirit, Tridentine Popery and primitive Christianity—the last having for its doctrinal symbol the Nicene Creed, and for its worship and discipline those maintained by our branch of the Church Catholic. As for the first, we consider it demonstrably certain that it acts as a disintegrator of national life, and a slow solvent of all definite and positive theological truth. As for the second, it has been too often proved to require fresh evidence here that it is little better, viewed as an organized system, than a bastard imitation—a cunning counterfeit of the Gospel of Christ—and as such by all its instincts, incurably hostile to the elastic temper and thoughtful liberty of a free people. To surrender, therefore, the public conscience to the guardianship of either of these, would be to surrender the nation's hope of permanent greatness. To the third and last, then, the field belongs, however feebly it may now assert its claim or exhibit its capacity to occupy it. To this the nation must look for the religion which shall consolidate, harmonize, and sanctify the contradictory elements out of which its character must be built. In this view, what must be the significance and importance of the highest Legislative body of a Church possessed of such capacities for national influence, and held to such tremendous responsibilities! We confess that no words seem to us adequate to express them, save those which a lower range of thought would deem exaggerated and absurd.

The transition from the national aspects of the General Convention to the national spirit which characterized its proceedings is easy and natural. If we except its religious tone and purpose, the very fact, indeed, that it was an ecclesiastical assembly, nothing contributed so much to render its deliberations august and impressive as this spirit of thorough nationality. Every state and nearly every territory were represented. And, though the lot was appealed to, to determine the seats to be occupied by the several delegations, it turned out that they were grouped in a way to confirm by visible relationship this conspicuous feature of the body. New Hampshire and Texas, Pennsylvania and Alabama, Connecticut and Maryland, Wis-

consin and North Carolina, Rhode Island and Tennessee, Michigan and Missouri, Vermont and Indiana, Georgia and California, sat side by side, and often voted side by side upon the more important questions of the session. All were profoundly impressed with the conviction that it was not a Northern or a Southern, an Eastern or a Western Church assembled there; but an American Church, still mighty in its power to pacify sectional strife and conserve the blessings of civil and fraternal union. It was felt that as a bond of such union no fibre in it had been jarred or loosened by the wild waves of agitation rolling without. No man there but shuddered at the thought of a rupture either in civil or religious ties. No man but went home with a new sense of the value of a united Church and a united Country, and with a firmer resolve to labor for their perpetuation.

As for the Church, she was sent to minister in all latitudes and to all peoples. To her *all are one in Christ Jesus*, and therefore her message is for the bond as well as the free, for masters and servants, for white and black, for "all sorts and conditions of men." To all these she has ministered, and to all these, if true to her mission, she must continue to minister. To-day she preaches Christ and His Gospel amid the hills of New England and on the prairies of the west; on the shores of the two great oceans and on the savannahs of the sunny south. Without suspicion and without prejudice she utters in the regions of slave as well as free labor her voice of instruction, consolation, and hope, she tells all of sin and the judgment, she points all to Him who was lifted up on Calvary for the healing of the nations, and proclaims trumpet-tongued the freedom wherewith Christ makes free. And never was the resolution stronger than now among her clergy and laity to keep her in a position to render effective this most catholic and blessed function.

As might be expected, a body over whom the broad ties of country were so influential would not be prone to serious differences in the minor matters which might come before them. This brings us to note the next feature of the Convention, as characteristic of its moral temper: viz, the calm, cheerful, conciliatory, and yet earnest spirit which marked the discussions, as well as the actual legislation of the Session. There were no foregone conclusions, no obstinate resistances, no partisan pressure of side issues. Whatever was proposed was finally settled—or at least was meant to be—on its own merits, with an intelligent and prayerful, though as we must think, occasionally mistaken reference to the Church's future interests. Through-

out the session of the House of Bishops not a party vote occurred; while in the other House, the only case which can possibly be regarded as an exception to the same statement, was so mixed up with considerations of supposed courtesy and expediency, as well nigh to eliminate those differences of theological sentiment which usually originate and determine party action. At any rate, the majority, in the vote alluded to, loudly and positively disclaim that they acted from party motives—a disclaimer which, in our opinion, should preserve the record of the Lower House as unblemished in this respect as that of the Upper.

And yet this happy state of things was not due to any unusual uniformity of opinion. All shades and schools of theological thought allowed within the Church were strongly and numerous represented. There were diversities of opinion, but no organized antagonism of action. Opposing measures were introduced; but none were aimed at the supposed peculiarities of party. Men were grouped, for the time, neither as High nor Low Churchmen; but as conservatives and progressives, as opponents or advocates of specific changes in the Church's working system. Never, we venture to say, in the history of the Church was there in one of her great councils a more striking exemplification of the noble maxim, "In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, and in all things charity."

The business of the Convention ranged itself mainly under three heads: viz, Missions, Worship, and Discipline. We shall review it in the order indicated by these heads. It was regretted by many, and should be by all, that the Missions of the Church did not occupy a larger proportion of the time of the Convention. Still, we are not aware that any leading interest in this department was neglected. Such is the established plan for conducting our Missionary system, that a very considerable share of the business belonging to it, is transacted by what is known as the Board of Missions, which meets annually. The Board held several spirited meetings for revising and improving the Church's work at home and abroad, and great good was done by the various addresses and discussions. Yet it would have been well had the Convention itself given more attention to this most important interest. Its plans, its labors, its wants, its discouragements and successes, demanded more of serious and careful consideration.

Without question, the Church's first duty is to publish the Word and grace of God. Its very organization, to be a living one, must be a missionary one. It cannot pause in this work at any specified limits—no shores or boundaries hedge it in.

Its field is the world; and the health, the vitality, the inward power and heavenly aspiration of the Church depend on the earnestness and vigor with which it strives to occupy that field. Its own life grows strong and pure and deep according as it yearns to manifest itself. Its own future grows bright only as it reflects the light cast along its pathway to the midst of nations yet lying in darkness. These are truths which reason, history, and the Word of God alike declare to be imperative in their demands and universal in their application. They have their being in and their power from the Church's everlasting commission. Therefore while we are disposed to make the most of what was done to meet such a duty, we cannot but regret that it was so little.

It has long been felt that the Board of Missions was not of sufficient numerical size to represent adequately all parts of the Church. To mend this fault the number of members was more than doubled, so that now, the Board will have besides the Bishops and life members, two clergymen and two laymen from each diocese, chosen from the various sections with reference to their supposed zeal in the cause, and their capacity to help it. It is hoped, by thus enlarging the Board and taking in a new set of minds and hearts, that a fresh impulse will be given to its work. Time only can tell whether this hope will be realized.

The department of Foreign Missions was regarded as, on the whole, in a promising condition, and it was resolved to commit the Church to increased labors among the pagan millions of Asia and Africa. It was also earnestly recommended to re-establish the Mission in the Ottoman Empire. The recent changes in that region, arising out of the agitations and wars in the East, inspire the hope that vast good may now be done there by well directed missionary efforts. The amount contributed by the Church for Foreign Missions during the year from October to October was \$75,000. In Africa, China, and Greece there are now in the service 20 missionaries, 20 assistants, 12 native teachers, and 1413 scholars in the several schools. These brief statements show what, as a Church, we are doing to *preach the Gospel among all nations*. The figures are small, very small; and the most that can be said of them is that they give assurance of a good beginning. It admonishes us of the vastness of the work lying ahead. It is only as a stray sheaf from an un-gathered harvest, or as the small spring flowing through the fissured rock and over a surface which one day must become the bed of an ocean.

In the department of Domestic Missions the contributions during the year reached nearly \$50,000. The number of Missionary stations reported is 144; the number of missionaries, 90. These

are scattered over the new States and Territories of the country—apparently a large number, and yet in view of the demands upon the Church, a mere handful.

By the nearly unanimous action of the House of Bishops, Nebraska and Kansas, hitherto under the charge of the Missionary Bishop of the Northwest, were erected into a separate jurisdiction, and a Missionary Bishop nominated to take immediate charge of it. This was justly regarded as one of the important acts of the Session, and what was remarkable, the House of Bishops, in response to the request of the new Board of Missions, decided with entire unanimity on the course to be pursued and the man to be sent. There was much in the present, but still more in the prospective needs of those Territories to make the case urgent. A noble opportunity was afforded to carry the Church into a new field in the integrity of her organization, and, for once, to send forward the Episcopate as the pioneer and practical center of Missionary activity. Altogether, when first proposed, it seemed to be a measure against which no serious objection could be started; but in favor of which all shades of opinion and classes of Churchmen would cordially concur. Grievous and bitter, therefore, was the disappointment that so judicious and timely a measure failed of confirmation by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. By a small majority of the Clergy, the Laity going strongly the other way, it was decided to be inexpedient, in view of existing circumstances. And it aggravates the case not a little, to know that even this small majority was secured by a piece of parliamentary management commendable only in the strifes of Congressional legislation. Many worthy and influential presbyters exhibited in their opposition, so palpable and surprising an inconsistency with their theological antecedents and long standing professions, as to admit of explanation, only on the ground that they acted with an imperfect knowledge of facts, and with an undue regard for considerations of a strictly extraneous and accidental character. We need not speak of our own regrets—nay, our grief and chagrin—at the turn which this matter took at the time, and at the shape in which it now stands. To do so, were only to reiterate the voice of the whole Church from one extremity to the other. Nothing gave so much moral force to the General Convention of 1853 as the sending forth of the Missionary Bishops of California and Oregon. Nearly everything else then done has been comparatively forgotten. This act, meanwhile, towers along the memory of the Church. Its significance deepens and widens as those Pacific empires rise along the shores of that silent sea. Would that the Convention of 1856 had put a like seal of im-

mortality upon its labors, and taken hold of the grateful recollections of another generation by sending out into those vast territories, with a unanimous sanction, a Chief Pastor able and fit to cope with the emergencies incident to new States and spreading races.

We come now to what was done in regard to Worship—or that which embodies the Worship of the Church—the Book of Common Prayer. It was supposed by many, that the various topics growing out of this matter would chiefly engross the time and attention of the Convention; whereas, save in the House of Bishops it engrossed very little of either. In order to appreciate what was done, it will be necessary to revert to the spirit and design of discussions previous to the meeting of the Convention. It will be remembered that for the past few years our newspapers and periodicals have largely discussed certain proposed changes—not, as some seem to think, in the Liturgy itself, but in the use of the Liturgy. For some time back, there has been a portion of the Clergy, all the while growing in numbers and influence, who have expressed the conviction that our Ritual was too unbending, that it required for its own highest efficiency more flexibility in the rubrics and a more careful adaptation to the wants of the Church in its missionary and aggressive character. They have urged the expediency of granting a larger discretion to the Clergy in so adapting it to times and occasions. They have claimed that in some cases the Services were too long, and that, though edifying in settled and educated congregations, they were too complicated and wearisome for parishes newly gathered and altogether untrained. They have urged the propriety of revising the Calendar of Lessons with a view of improving the selections for particular seasons; also the propriety of revising the collection of Hymns, so that some now in use might be abandoned, and others of greater merit introduced. They have asked, moreover, for a larger number of Special Prayers to be used on occasions for which there is now no suitable provision.

Such, in substance, were the changes—if changes they can be called—asked for by a numerous and respectable portion of the Clergy. And to show that they were neither disloyal to the Liturgy in its present form, nor desirous of needless innovations, nor wanting in sound and discriminating conservatism, they appealed to the facts that the Prayer Book had already undergone revision and emendation four times since the Reformation, and that the last two hundred years had been signalized by wonderful modifications of all the relations of mankind; facts very

properly justifying the inquiry, at least, whether, after the lapse of such a period and the occurrence of such changes in the world's thought, temper, and manners, some corresponding changes were not required in a System of Worship whose glory should consist not only in being Scriptural in tone, and primitive in structure, but also Catholic in its reach over the human heart. In addition to these subjects of petition, some extreme men advocated the expediency of extending Episcopal Orders on certain conditions to the ministers of other Communions. But as this comes under the head of discipline it will not be farther alluded to here.

These views were brought before the House of Bishops in the shape of a Memorial praying them, as the Fathers of the Church and as her highest and wisest Counselors, to take such action as they deemed best on the topics thus introduced to their notice. This Memorial was presented at the Convention of 1853. The House of Bishops appointed five of their number to sit, during the three years ensuing, as a special Commission to consider the wishes of the petitioners. This Commission sent out circulars through the Church inviting replies from the leading Clergy to the questions therein contained. The result was, that when the five Bishops met, preparatory to shaping their report, they had before them, in addition to their own views and labors, a vast amount of carefully formed opinions from all parts of the Church. Their Report to the House of Bishops in the last Convention was the joint product of all this collected learning and mature experience. Acting upon this Report, the House of Bishops, after long and animated discussion, resolved that no legislation was necessary to meet the wants of the Memorialists; that the structure of the Prayer Book need not be touched in order to secure all the adaptation asked for; that all needful liberty in administering the Services might be obtained by a more just and liberal interpretation of the Rubrics; and that it was part of the prerogative of every Bishop to provide for his diocese such special Prayers and Services as its emergencies might require. They accordingly adopted the following Preamble and Resolutions, as expressive of their opinions on the matters referred to them:

"Whereas, the order of worship, as prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, or as settled by usage, has been framed with special reference to established Parish Churches, and to a population already incorporated with the Church;

"And whereas our actual work is, or should be, among many not yet connected with our Congregations, or where there are no established Parishes, or where said Parishes are yet in their infancy;

"And whereas there are, or may be, in different Dioceses, peculiar emergencies,

arising out of the character and condition of certain portions of the population, which demand some special services;

"And *whereas* it is desirable that the use of the Book of Common Prayer, as the vehicle of the Church's devotions, should be such as to cultivate an enlightened love for the Liturgy, and enable the clergy and people to make their labors for Christ more effective; therefore,

"Resolved, as the opinion of the House of Bishops,

"I. That the Order for Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Communion Office being originally separate services, may be used separately, under the advice of the Bishop of the Diocese.

"II. That on extraordinary occasions or at special services, not otherwise provided for, Ministers may, at their discretion, use such parts of the Book of Common Prayer, and such Lessons from Holy Scripture as shall in their judgment tend most to edification.

"III. That the Bishops of the several Dioceses may provide such special services, as, in their judgment, shall be required by the peculiar spiritual necessities of any class or portion of the population within said Dioceses; provided that such services shall not take the place of those prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer in Congregations capable of its use."

By thus giving to the Church a mere declaration of opinion, they avoided the necessity of making any new laws, or altering any old ones, or even touching the letter of a rubric. And thus, too, the whole subject was not more adroitly than wisely kept out of the Lower House. If a law had been made, or a Canon altered, or a rubric modified, it could have been done only by the joint action of the two Houses. But as only an opinion was given, no such joint action was needed. And yet that opinion of the Bishops, as was ably and eloquently urged by distinguished members of the Lower House, will have the moral force of law, while the absence of formal enactment and the vigilant watchfulness of conservative men will save the Church from dangerous innovations. It will be seen at once that those Resolutions cover a great deal of ground, and open the way for some changes in the mode of conducting Public Service not hitherto sanctioned by common usage.

Most gratifying proof was given by all of an immovable attachment to the Prayer Book, and of a profound desire that it might be handed on unchanged in any important particular. Some, however, thought it entirely consistent with these feelings, and even demanded by a wholesome and intelligent conservatism, to advocate certain minor changes which affected neither the principle nor the form of the Liturgy, but only advanced its efficiency. Others, and they apparently a very large majority of the Clergy and Laity, declared the *use* of the Prayer Book, in one sense, to be the Prayer Book. Change the use, and in effect the thing used is changed. Let the mode of conducting Public Service be one way in one Diocese, and another way in another Diocese, and the real uni-

formity of our Worship would practically be destroyed. It was argued, moreover, in opposition to any changes whatever, that the convenience likely to result from them would be more than counterbalanced by the moral damage arising from such an example of instability. It was urged, too, that this Book of devotion contained the best elements of our past life as a Church, that it had come down to us as a sacred deposit, that it had become to the common heart of the Church an object of reverence and love, that its merits had already drawn multitudes to its use, that its permanence and uniformity enter essentially into its power for good; and that with the best intentions to improve it, its revisers would create more evils than they would remove. Such were the two grades of Conservatism drawn out by the discussion of the Memorial question. They are precisely those which the genius of our Church naturally produces, and represent, respectively, the coördinate necessity of movement and stability.

The same body of Clergy who asked for action on the aforementioned points, also prayed the Bishops to take some steps looking to a removal, absolute or partial, of the divisions which now separate and distract the great body of those who call themselves Christians; in other words, to do something to revive the lost Unity of Christendom. They were moved to ask this by facts which have long pained the conscience and sensibilities of every true lover of Christ; facts patent to the world; facts which have done more than any other cause to retard the spread of the Gospel, to palsy its tongue in heathen lands, and to weaken its effective power over unbelief and wickedness everywhere. The facts referred to are simply those which go to make up the history of Sectarian organizations and Sectarian conflicts and alienations—the history of Christians professing the same Lord, the same Faith, and the same Baptism, yet battling with one another under names of human device, unknown to the Word of God. In view of the prayer sent up to them on this sad and awful phasis of Christendom the House of Bishops gave to the world the following declaration, and proposed the following measure:

“That in view of the desirableness of union amongst Christians, and as a pledge of willingness to communicate or receive information tending to that end; and in order to conference if occasion or opportunity should occur; this House will appoint by ballot, a Committee of five Bishops, as an organ of communication or conference with such Christian bodies or individuals as may desire it; to be entitled the Commission on Church Unity.

"That, in making the above appointment, it is distinctly understood that the Commission is clothed with no authority to mature plans of unity with other Christian bodies, or to propound expositions of doctrine or discipline."

Who can but rejoice that such a step has been taken by this Church, that such a testimony has gone forth from her on this all-important subject. It is right that she should speak first and strongest—she, who had a being and a history before these Sects were born—she, out of whom many of them went forth taking of her riches but mutilating her Faith and Order—she, who to-day holds fast and cherishes with sacred love the same Creed, the same Order, the same Sacraments which constituted the essential bonds of unity when the Church walked as one body under the guidance of those whom Apostles' hands had touched, and a martyr's death had consecrated. It may be that her overtures will be scouted. It may be that the bitter sect spirit of the time will revile and sneer at them. Still it will now go on record that this Branch of the Church has, in this regard, done her duty, and put herself into an attitude friendly to the revival of Christian concord and Ecclesiastical Unity. Our own opinion is that this well intended and praiseworthy effort will, for the present, be utterly fruitless. There are many preliminaries, as serious as they are difficult, to be settled before anything can be done with the main question. Humanly speaking, it seems idle to undertake to gather into one fold the various divisions of Christians—each strong in numbers, intelligence, and peculiar attachments, so long as there exists such a radical disagreement as to the very nature of Unity—its terms—its notes—nay, its very desirableness, if to be had only under a visible form. A large part of Protestant Christians, (though we are glad to see a movement in a different direction, and that too in influential quarters,) profess to find no warrant in Scripture for Visible Unity. They regard history as testifying against both its necessity and expediency. They reprobate it as a cause and an effect of a tendency to despotic centralization. They condemn it as oppressive to the free energies of spiritual life. They even profess to see in the sect principle a prolific source of blessing and religious power. With such views abroad, all proposals for Unity, as we understand it, can be of no avail. Doctrinal differences, conflicting notions of expediency, and hereditary alienations must first be reconciled. Men must be convinced of the desirableness of a given result before they can be induced to coöperate in producing it. Still we hope for the best even amid, what we feel to be, overwhelming discouragements.

There is only one rule for Churches and individuals in the work assigned them, and that is to do their duty and leave the consequences to God. As an act of faith—as an expression of desire for the recovery of a lost pearl of great price—as a step taken by a growing and active branch of the Church Catholic toward peace and order in God's Kingdom, we cannot—the world at large cannot—but regard the establishment, at this time, of a special Commission on Unity as clothed with profound significance.

We cannot leave this division of our subject without a few words on what the "Memorial" movement has accomplished. It is certainly extraordinary that so brief an agitation on such matters should have been so speedily crowned with even partial success. The fact that it has been, shows that the Church in her thinking and acting adopts the rapid processes now common to all other departments of life. The "Memorial" has done more than now appears on the surface. The least of its influence is to be found in the formal and specific action which it secured from the House of Bishops. Chiefly occupied with the work of the Church and the best methods to do it; conspicuously practical and with a decided bent toward broader plans of action and nobler schemes of Christian charity, it has nevertheless made itself felt in the grave province of theological thought. By introducing fresh subjects of inquiry, and giving a new turn to discussion it has furnished a happy substitute for the protracted and acrimonious controversies of rival schools in dogmatic theology, who for many years monopolized the attention of the Church. It has led to truer conceptions of the nature, offices, and relations of Liturgical Worship; and to a more liberal and discriminating estimate of the Church's discretionary power over all Ritual arrangements. It has secured, moreover, a better understanding of what is *mutable* and what is *immutable* in the Catholic System,—of what times and manners may change, and of what must stand fast amid the changing of times and manners—a sort of knowledge essential to the Church in an age of quick and facile adaptations, an age which measures the value and force of every institution by its power to project itself into the world's thought, society, and enterprise. We say, therefore, that this movement before it closes will vindicate for itself a distinguished place in the history of our Church during this generation. Its originators and advocates may have erred in some things and failed utterly in others; they may have proposed some impracticable measures; but they have not failed to make their mark.

We pass now to the subject of Discipline—which, in the

shape of new modes of trial for accused Bishops and Presbyters and increased facilities for the administration of Ecclesiastical justice, occupied more of the time of the House than any other class of subjects. Indeed, the attention given it was out of all proportion to its relative importance. This fact gave to the whole Body the appearance of having come together from all quarters of the country to legislate for the detection and trial of unworthy officers of the Church. The subject was introduced at the very beginning of the Session; and once fairly before the two Houses, there was no alternative but to dispose of it. Discipline viewed in this aspect is always an unpleasant thing. It reminds us that even the Church of God must sometimes be purged, and that bad men now and then creep into her Councils and defile her high places. Discipline is a necessity. There must be a judicial system for bringing offenders to justice and exposing official delinquencies. One or two cases within the past few years had served to bring the subject prominently before the Church and also to show that its present system contained many serious defects. At the Convention of 1853, a special Committee was appointed to consider the whole matter and report to the Convention of 1856. Their Report was able and learned, showing a thorough grasp of the principles of Canon Law and a profound experience in the details of Ecclesiastical Courts. This Report proposed to the Convention a uniform system of trial for all the Orders in the Ministry, to operate throughout the Church, irrespective of diocesan limits. This plan encountered serious objections. Among other things, it was urged that it took away from the Dioceses a right which they had always exercised, and usually with wisdom and energy—the right, namely, to discipline their own Presbyters and Deacons. While the question was pending a stranger would have supposed that the old Political contest between Federal consolidation and State Rights—a contest which has given to the world the choicest eloquence and the ripest wisdom of American statesmanship—was duly domiciled in the Church. After a protracted discussion, carried on mainly by the legal talent of the House, it was determined to confine the scheme to Bishops—leaving the other Orders to the care of their respective Dioceses.

Into this scheme was incorporated a new and valuable feature—styled a Board of Inquiry. It is the duty of this Board to hear all accusations and complaints and to decide whether they afford ground for trial. Its functions are not unlike those of a Grand Jury in our Civil Courts. The peculiar advantages of the system now adopted are that it is conformed to the prin-

ciples of the *Common Law*; that the rule of evidence is made that of the State in which the trial occurs; that it simplifies and facilitates the processes of justice, while it affords better safeguards against malicious prosecution and surer protection for the innocent. Though the result is thus simply stated, the elaboration of the scheme consumed the whole of the first week of the Session;—so very difficult was it found to unravel the complications and reconcile the contradictions incident to opposing views; and to produce a plan that would command general assent. While it is not agreeable to remember that so many days were given to the subject, yet it is worthy of congratulation that the Church is at last provided with a system which will ensure efficiency and win public respect.

Having thus treated the leading heads under which the business of the Convention may properly be arranged, we are constrained by lack of space to pass over, with little more than a bare mention, two important Canons whose enactment was demanded by cases of special grievance on the part of a Western Diocese and an Eastern Parish. The Canon on Episcopal visitation has, we are rejoiced to see, been already followed by the happiest results. It has put an end to a long and painful controversy and restored official, if not friendly, intercourse between a Bishop and a portion of his flock justly distinguished for most of the elements of parochial strength and prosperity. What will be the effect of the Canon on Episcopal Residence upon the case which suggested it, remains to be seen. At present it promises well. What lover of the Church's honor, to say nothing of her other interests, does not hope that its admonitory and penal voice will be promptly heeded? The very fact that such a Canon was needed, and the additional fact that it passed the Lower House by the most emphatic and significant vote of the Session evidenced the fixed determination of the Church to reform or to punish such anomalous offenders and amateur dignitaries, as non-resident Bishops. The *prestige* of the Episcopate has already suffered from the mere passage of this law. But if it be met by circuitous delays ultimately to lapse into positive disobedience, then we say advisedly that the *morale* of the American Episcopate will be damaged as it never has been by the saddest and darkest event in its history. We trust, however, that no such alternative is before us. Illinois is entitled to the domicil of her Bishop. Non-residence is death to Lay as well as Clerical sympathy and coöperation. The Western heart can never be reached, its affinities for the Church developed, or its mighty capacities for good be brought into action by an agency, half alien and half domestic.

The General Theological Seminary received more than its usual share of attention. The discussions called out by its present embarrassments and its doubtful future, were so plain and pointed as to forbid the possibility of mistake as to the views and wishes of the Church at large. It was evident that a very great majority would hail with pleasure the day which should consummate its transfer to the Diocese of New York. Few regarded it as any longer a General Institution except in name, and nearly all deemed it impracticable to attempt to make it anything else. The proxy system of voting was again enacted, probably only to be again rejected by the Board of Trustees. Much good advice came from various sources, but that it will be immediately heeded is too much to expect.

There was one concomitant of the General Convention which we should be glad to notice more at length. We refer to the Meetings and proceedings of the several Voluntary Societies connected with and doing much of the work of the Church. If we are to judge by the efforts made in its behalf or by the array of eminent and zealous friends it called out, none was so conspicuous as the Sunday School Union and Church Book Society. The prompt and generous manner in which some fourteen thousand dollars was pledged from various Dioceses to extricate it from its heavy financial difficulties was a noble and just tribute to the value of the Institution; and ought to be a strong guarantee for its more prudent and effective management hereafter.

It is the habit of many to expect too much from the mere work of legislation. They regard the prosperity and growth of the Church as largely involved in what is done in such Conventional bodies. They look for increased vigor and activity in the Church's appropriate tasks from the repeal of this or that law, provision, or rubric. They depend vastly on the making or the modifying of Canons to adapt the Church to the wants of the age and the emergencies of our spreading empire. They look to Conventions to set forward the Church some signs on the zodiac of progress. Such persons are in error; and as they expect too much, cannot but be disappointed. We would not underrate the work of such an august assembly as the General Convention. We are sure that its beneficent energies have never been fully developed. But, after all, such bodies when best conducted deal with effects, rather than causes, with machinery rather than power. They represent the sentiment of the Church; but do not create it. They toil on the outside. They plough, harrow, and fence—but they sow little. They have little command over the forces which create the harvest and

pour fertility along the soil. Not unto them belong the sunshine, and the rain, and the free wind of God's Kingdom. These lie near to each one of us that truly loves

"The Church our blest Redeemer saved
With his own precious blood."

These belong to the sphere of the individual heart—to the sphere where companies of Christians toil on within the bounds of parishes to do their Lord's work. The life of the Church is the gift of God through His Son Jesus—reproduced in the lives of her members. Some delude themselves with the thought that the Church adds to her real power as a spiritual kingdom by adding to her wealth and social strength. Mere riches, mere refinement, mere worldly strength are only glittering spangles upon her seamless robe. She may be great and victorious without them. She may be mean and vanquished with them. Let us remember that if sloth, parsimony, and selfishness prevail among our people; and low, perfunctory views of the ministry among our Clergy,—then a moral disease is in our loins and about our heart which no legislative enactments, no canons, no toning up or toning down of rubrics, no alterations or abbreviations of the Prayer Book can cure. The only effective medicine is in a heartier embrace of the truth and a readier following of the example of our ascended Lord. It is to be found in life, not law; in activity in every department of duty, not in Conventions, Commissions, and Conferences. It comes of prayer, and faith, and love issuing in *work*.

ART. VII.—FREE SEATS.

OUR friend of Pews, who took the field once more in the October number of the *Review*, in reply to our advocacy of Free Seats in July, complains that our "blows, however hearty and vigorous in themselves, are feeble in effect, because badly aimed." We shall try to come a little nearer to the mark this time.

Our ground, in July, was clearly and definitely mapped out, and formed one consistent whole. We undertook to investigate whether of the two systems was to be preferred,—*Free Seats?*—or *Pews?* We began, therefore, by disentangling the discussion from its several side issues,—as to having "a part of the seats free," as to "large plate collections," and as to "courtesy;" showing that these, being points *common to both*, must be omitted from a consideration of the *comparative* claims of each, as rivals of each other. In this we acted on a simple mathematical principle, the correctness of which no one who has ever studied algebra as far as equations of the first degree, can question for a moment.

We then proceeded to lay down the *definition* of the two systems, in clear and precise terms. The testimony of History was examined, and found to be in favor of *Free Seats*, as the plan upon which the Church had gained her first growth and strength, and which had been her main weapon of conquest in mediæval and modern times also, even down to the middle of this nineteenth century. We looked then to the history of Pews, and followed out *their* working, showing that they lead to the gradual starving and deadening of the best life of the Church, the diverting her streams into strange pastures, and the making barren the garden of the Lord.

We next examined the excuses given for the Pew-system;—that it is "convenient," and that "it keeps families together," and found no substance in them. We showed that the soul of the Pew-system consisted in its *exclusiveness*,—the power to keep others out—and that this was the *quid pro quo* in the *bargain* by which the use of a pew was bought for so much a year. We proved that it set up a wrong standard of Christian liberality,—one which went far to neutralize the solemn warnings and exhortations of Holy Scripture in the Offertory. And finally, that the general result of the system in *supporting the*

Church in this country, was such that from one end of the land to the other, there was one continuous cry about the *starvation of the clergy*.

We gave a number of facts, from existing Free Church enterprises, showing that the principle could and would succeed, even on the low estimate of returns in dollars and cents,—an estimate, however, the justice of which we denied. We then examined the essence of the principles on both sides, according to Holy Scripture. We demonstrated that the support of the Church ought to come, not from bargain and sale, settled before the preacher can begin to preach; but from the fountains of faith and love in the breasts of true believers. And we found that Pew-rents, being the proceeds of mere bargain and sale according to a worldly standard, could not be rightfully regarded as the offerings of faith and love. We showed, moreover, that *growth* was the first and greatest law of the Church's practical life. She *must* go on conquering and to conquer, until the knowledge of the Lord covereth the earth as the waters cover the sea. We appealed to that which is now an admitted axiom on all sides, that the true life of the Church is in her *Missionary work*. For the success of this Missionary work, we proved the Free Seat plan to be absolutely indispensable. And we closed by an appeal, based upon the position of the Church in this country,—everywhere a little flock in comparison of those who yet remain to be gathered in; and yet called to greater efforts than ever before, by the fact that God is preparing the masses all around her to enter her doors, if she will but open and let them in.

Now it will be seen at once, that our main object in the above was to separate, as clearly as possible, two contradictory principles. In order, therefore, to conduct the discussion clearly and intelligently, we distinguished the operations of the two, as they are found mingled in our common working system, giving to each the credit which belonged to the *principle* involved. The summing up of this, we embodied in the *definition* of the two, clearly and categorically laying down the points in which the two meet and contradict one another. We would suggest to our friend, that until that definition is demonstrated to be incorrect, nothing is done. We here repeat it:—

The Free Church plan offers the preaching of the Gospel *free to all*. It asks no one to contribute for the "support of the Church," except such as have first heard and received the Gospel. It asks them to give *then*, only from their *Faith* in God, their *hope* of Heaven, and their *love* both toward the Lord Jesus who hath given unto them salvation, and toward their brethren who are one with them in Him. And the standard of "how much" each one shall give, is no

other than that which Holy Scripture has set forth,—“according as *he is able*.” In other words, the *free hearing* of the Gospel is a condition *precedent* to the duty of “*supporting the Church* ;” and the *measure of that duty is God’s Word*.

The Pew-system, on the other hand, does not offer the Gospel free to any; but furnishes it only to those who have paid for the privilege. It asks a certain rent for the “support of the Church,” and asks it, not from Christian but from commercial considerations, the seat being worth just as much “rent” to the Church, whether its occupant love God or not. The standard “how much” each shall pay, is regulated solely by the prominence, convenience for seeing and hearing, and general “eligibility,” of the pew, having nothing whatever to do with the “ability” of the giver. In other words, the *paying* for the “support of the Church,” is a condition *precedent*, without which no man can expect to *hear the preaching of the Gospel*; and the measure of that duty is regulated by the world.

This definition of the terms employed, is the kernel of this whole discussion. Our friend of the October Number is skillful enough to know the importance of definitions; that they are in themselves more than half the battle; and that if our definition of the Pew-system, (as reduced to those principles which alone distinguish it from the other,) could be proved incorrect, the whole edifice of our argument would tumble to the ground. Knowing, then, the importance of this definition, how has he treated it? Has he demonstrated it to be erroneous? No. Has he then attacked it? No. Has he so much as alluded to it in any way? No. He has indeed remarked slightly upon one introductory process, indirectly trying to make it appear that what is a difference of *principle*, is only a question of *degree*. And in this attempt, he makes use of a couple of illustrations, from which one might infer,—if it were worth while,—that in his opinion the proportion of free pews to rented, ought to be no greater than the relative bulk of pepper to that of the soup it flavors, or rather, for minuteness, like “the small fraction of a grain of prussic acid,” which is in some cases used as a medicine, but a larger dose of which would be fatal. This proportion is, indeed, very near that in which some pewed Churches, that we wot of, have “a part of their seats free.” But, in reply to that definition which contains the very *jugulum causae*, our friend very prudently says—absolutely nothing.

Nay, more, our historical sketch both of Free Seats and Pews, (except so far as concerns the present state of things among us now,) is left wholly uncontradicted by him. No reply whatever is given to our analysis of the essence of the Pew-system, showing that it reverses the proper relation between Faith and Works, that it consists in the purchasing of a right to *keep others out* of the pew thus rented or bought, and is thereby directly antagonistical to *growth*. Not a syllable is offered in opposition to the principle that growth is the first great practical law

of life to the Church, to which all things else must be made to yield. The generally miserable support of the clergy on the Pew-system is acknowledged instead of being denied. Nor is any disproof given of our position that we are now called to make every possible exertion to secure that great growth for which Providence has so wonderfully prepared the ground on every side of us. Indeed, it is to these, which formed the fundamental framework of our Article, that our friend alludes, when he actually calls them "a series of propositions which *no-body has ever dreamed of disputing*." Certainly he has not disputed them.

One might well ask, then, Where is the use of attempting a reply? To an ordinary mind it would seem as if, with the citadel and all the outer ramparts left untouched, there was really nothing to hope from further attack. But not so our friend. He thinks that all these things may be just as true as we assert them to be, and yet "leave the question in dispute just as it was!" We are, therefore, reluctantly compelled to the weariness of following him in his endeavor to make something out of nothing. We shall find that effort naturally betraying him into a variety of contradictions, confusions, irrelevancies; and, finally, the complete concession of all that we have contended for.

The contradictions, indeed, are too numerous for us to point them all out. Our friend begins, for instance, by saying that the true point of discussion "is not whether the Free Church system is not useful for certain purposes, nor whether it does not embody and represent true and important principles which have been too much overlooked, nor whether it is not, in particular cases, preferable to other systems and the true remedy of their evils, but whether it is entitled to take upon itself *jure divino* airs, or talk in a strain of special catholicity, and on one account or another claim exclusive possession of the Church as the ordinary and permanent rule of support. Such pretensions," he adds, "we believe to be groundless and ridiculous." As to "the ordinary and permanent rule of support," he will find it laid down in our *Definition* as being, on the Free Church plan, according to *the ability of the giver*. Will he deny that this is the rule which alone can rightfully claim exclusive possession of the Church? Or will he contend that an equal right belongs to the rule of "eligibility" as laid down in the definition of the Pew-system, the measure of duty being fixed by *the world*?

As to Catholicity, we made no particular flourish with that word; but if we had, our friend himself gives us sufficient au-

thority. He denounces the pretension to Catholicity, on one page, as "groundless and ridiculous;" and on another, as the "merest nonsense." And yet elsewhere he asserts positively, that "the spiritual equality of men in the Church of God, and the right of the poor and mean to equal privileges in His House with the rich and great, is a *Catholic principle*." And on the next page, he goes still further: "The truth is, there is nothing Catholic in the matter *but the principle* that the Church is to be furnished with the means of supporting her Clergy, and carrying on her benevolent operations, by the *free gifts of her members*." We ask no stronger declaration of Catholicity than this. And it was hardly worth while for our friend to deny this *Catholicity* so roundly at the beginning of his Article, when he so emphatically adopts it himself before he gets through. And this, too, he assures us, is the *main point* in the discussion!

But he demurs to the idea that this "free-will support" exists any more truly on the Free-Church plan, than the other. And he proves it in a curious way. He says that "there is nowhere else in the Church, where niggardliness and parsimony can skulk so securely as in a Free Church." That is to say, that on the Pew-system, by the pressure of commercial, or social, or family considerations, niggardliness and parsimony are not allowed to "skulk." They can be *forced* to pay something, whether they will or no. And that, of course, proves that Pew-rents are as wholly "*free-will offerings*" as anything given in a Free Church! The crowning contradiction to the voluntary virtue of Pew-rents, however, will be found on another page, where our friend claims peremptorily that, so far from being any such thing as free gifts, they are only an ordinary *debt*. They are, he tells us, no part of a man's alms, any more than "his butcher's bill or the bill for his children's schooling." A very pretty specimen of those *free-gifts*, which he tells us, are *Catholic in principle*! But more of this anon.

In connection with this question of Catholicity, we are sorry to see that, while handsomely proving the very matter which he set out to refute, our friend has thought it necessary to mask his retreat by a scattering shot at architecture, communion vessels, ecclesiastical tailors, and "going to Rome;" all of which, he admits, have nothing to do with the question; and in regard to which he says, "we intend no ungenerous insinuations against the Protestantism of the Free Church cause,"—thus disclaiming the only interpretation of which his gratuitous denunciation seems to be capable. But it is according to a very safe rule of controversy:—"When you have nothing to reply to what your opponent has said, fall-to lustily on something that

he has *not* said. It not only sounds decisive and triumphant, but it leaves the *impression* that your opponent *has* said it, and that you have demolished him." It is in accordance with the same useful rule, we suppose, that several pages are devoted to the refutation of certain interpretations of texts of Scripture which we never made, and in regard to which, we are admitted by him to have been "discreet." It helps, however, to fill up.

As to the alleged separation of families, we are glad that our friend at last admits, reluctantly, that it "is comparatively a light matter." This has been made so much of by the advocates of Pews, that we are happy to find *one* of them thus candid in acknowledging the truth. He says, indeed, that if, in practice, families are not separated, it is all the same as "saying that a Free Church will soon be a Free Church only in name." It is well enough for those who disapprove a system, to insist that some obnoxious feature is essential to it,—a feature which is unknown to its friends, and which they have always disclaimed, both as to theory and practice. Those who have not tried the Free Church plan, know what it requires so much better than those who have! A similar point is that of "self-support," which is insisted upon as if it were a vital part of the system. Nothing will be found concerning it in the *Definition*, any more than about "separation of families." All that the Free Church system asserts, is that it claims support on the *right* principles, rather than on the *wrong*. We have *faith* that God's way of providing for His Church is better than that invented by the world. We know that if Christians give "according to their ability," the treasury will abound far beyond the utmost wealth of the Pew-system. We know that the results, even as now visible, are a great improvement over the past. But we do not glory in the claim of "self-support," as we are supposed to do. Many, and indeed the larger number, of Free Church enterprises have been started in localities where few if any become members excepting the very poor. And they do well if they succeed in supporting their own parish; nor are they to be much blamed if they do not raise quite all that is needed for that purpose. These churches *win souls*; which is the first matter to be attended to. The other will take care of itself in God's own way.

This unwillingness to trust to *Faith* as a principle of action, is indeed painfully apparent in the argument of our friend. Instead of looking mainly to the growth of the Church, the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, the subject uppermost in his mind is, the *support of the Clergy*. "The whole tendency

of this Free Church doctrine," he says, "is to render the *support of the Clergy precarious and unsteady*." We beg leave to remind him, that the Free Church doctrine is, that every member of the Church should give "according to his ability;" and the whole tendency of *that* doctrine, we take it, is to render the support of the clergy more secure than under any other system. This is not its main object, however. God's whole mode of Providential government is, to bestow secondary blessings *indirectly*. If we seek first for our own personal happiness, we fail to find it. If we seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, all other things are added unto us. So if we look mainly to the support of the clergy, we shall fail even in that. But if we throw ourselves with our whole soul into the work of carrying on the kingdom of Christ, in the manner which He hath ordained, He will add unto us far more abundantly than we can provide for ourselves.

The want of this spirit of *Faith* lies also at the root of another error of our friend. Our Scriptural argument as to the proper motive for good works and free-will offerings has been altogether thrown away on him. He seems to regard such motives as very good things to preach about, but ridicules the notion of acting on them. He appears to have started with the idea that the Church is only a kind of a lecture-room, where everybody is expected to pay for the seat he occupies, and for nothing else. The collecting of alms at the Offertory is, to him, only "calling on the worshiper to pay for his seat on the spot," notwithstanding "all the fine things we have heard about alms and offerings." What can we do with a reasoner so utterly commercial in his fundamental conceptions of things pertaining to the kingdom of Heaven? Talk to him about the love of God in the soul, kindling it with burning zeal and the spirit of self-sacrifice, making it yearn to do something to show forth gratitude for the great gift of salvation: and our friend replies, "All those are very fine things to talk about; but, after all, *you know* you only want a man to pay for the bench-room he has been occupying while you have been preaching." We do not wonder that such an one is an advocate for the Pew-system.

There is no part of his Article in which he is more characteristic, than in his remarks about alms and offerings, and the mode in which they are to be distinguished from Pew-rents and the support of the clergy. Our readers may remember his original claim that Pew-rents should be considered offerings, and that when the treasurer of the parish had collected them, he might very well bring them to Church on Sunday morning, lay them on the alms-basin, have them offered reverently on the altar,

and got the minister to say the prayer for the Church militant over them. That process, he contended, would make them as completely free-will offerings as anything given on the Free Church system. Now, however, "a change comes o'er the spirit of his dream." This way of supporting the clergy turns out to have not an atom of charity, alms, or offerings in it. Hear him:—

"It remained for modern times to find out that a pastor's compensation is a charity, and that giving to one's self is doing an alms, if it is only put into a plate and set by priestly hands on an altar,—a form of almsgiving very likely to be popular, but better fitted to quiet consciences that ought not to be easy, than to produce a full treasury for the relief of God's poor and the enlargement of His kingdom. The blurring of a most vital and important moral distinction in this way is one of the prime vices of the system,—this leading a man to think that he is meeting the call of Christian benevolence, when he is simply paying a debt, and making that provision for his household, without which he has denied the Faith, and is worse than an infidel—by simply calling it an offering. The payment of money for the support of the Gospel for one's own good and the benefit of his household, is no more a part of his alms than his butcher's bill, or the bill for his children's schooling. There is as much benevolence in eating a beef-steak or putting on an *extra* garment in cold weather. That it thus confuses the idea of alms, puts the support of the clergy and of the local institutions of the Church on a false basis, and misleads people in regard to the moral nature and value of their own acts, is one of the gravest charges that can be brought against the Free-Church cause, and one to which its advocates seem singularly obtuse and insensible."

A happier or more admirable demolition of our friend's own notion about putting the pew-rents on the alms-basin, and *calling* them "offerings," it would be impossible to find. We thought, when we first read that notion of his, that *he* was "blurring a most vital and important moral distinction in this way," "confusing the idea of alms," and "misleading people in regard to the moral nature and value of their own acts;" and we congratulate him on having, at length; so cleverly *found it out*. As to our singular "obtuseness," we shall probably give him further specimens of it presently.

After thus stating, however, that supporting the clergy in this way of pew-rents, has "no more to do with almsgiving than buying a Bible, or paying the baker or the shoemaker," does the reader suppose that our friend is satisfied with thus contradicting himself? Nay, by no means. Nothing will content him, short of contradicting himself back again to the place he started from. He says, therefore:

"If a man pays his pew-rent in a *right spirit*, it is an *offering*. If a man puts money on a plate without a right spirit, it is not an offering. * * * * The claim of any superior purity, spirituality and religiousness, in the Free-Church way of giving, is all fudge. And that men are more likely to give in this way according to their ability, and as God hath prospered them, is an assertion whose boldness we admire. It approaches the sublime."

What is not given "in a right spirit," says our friend," is not

an offering." We know that Cain had not a right spirit; yet we read that he "brought of the fruit of the ground *an offering* unto the Lord;" and also that "unto Cain and to *his offering* He had not respect." Our friend would amend the phraseology of Moses, and would deny that Cain made any offering at all. Korah, Dathan and Abiram had not the right spirit; yet God himself declared that their censers should be taken up out of the burning, "for they offered them before the Lord;" and it was added, moreover, "*therefore they are hallowed.*" Thus proving that an "offering" does not consist wholly in the *spirit* of the offerer; but that it is a hallowed thing, even when the giver is so utterly destitute of the right spirit, as to be made of God to "go down quick into hell." Our friend has simply, with great success, confounded that which constitutes an offering, with that which alone renders the *person* of the offerer acceptable in the sight of God. Cain had the one, Abel both. Korah had the one, Aaron both. Any man may bring his offering. But it is only when the fire of *Love* is kindled under the slain animal, that the offering becomes one of a *sweet-savor* unto the Lord.

But it is amusing to see the facility with which this "right-spirit" restores the departed virtue to pew-rents, and makes them "offerings" once more. It is the old Jesuitical trick of *directing the intention* aright. That was the spiritual alchemy that transmuted all it touched to gold. So here. This pew-rent is roundly denied to be anything different in kind from the dues of the butcher, or the baker, or the shoemaker; and is placed on the same level of spirituality as eating a beef-steak or putting on a great-coat in winter. We suppose, therefore, of course, that by only paying the butcher *in the right-spirit*, the amount of his "bill" may be reckoned an "offering" likewise—equal to anything given in Free-Churches—and so also of the "baker," and the "shoemaker," and the beef-steak, great-coat and all. A large item would then be the charity-account in most families!

And yet we are told that it is a very bold assertion to maintain that men are more likely to give according to their ability on the Free-Church plan, (where the highest motives, and those only, are constantly kept before the people,) than on this other system, which degrades things divine to the level of the butcher and baker; and, as a motive-power for good, confounds grace with groceries. To make such an assertion, we are assured, "approaches the sublime." Perhaps it does. It is none the worse for that. The calling upon men to give up their hold on the things of time and sense, and that on the

basis of simple faith, and hope, and love, and duty towards God, lifts poor fallen man to a height which is otherwise not only unattainable, but inconceivable; and may well be said to "approach the sublime." If our friend thinks this "sublime" a thing to be *avoided*, however, as his language evidently implies, he need feel no uneasiness as to his own position. He is in no danger of approaching any such thing on his principles. He has reached the well-known opposite of it already. In vain do we essay to raise up his eyes in faith towards heaven, or persuade him to lay hold upon the anchor of hope, or beseech him to kindle with the flame of charity. With face bent over obstinately to the earth, he goes on fumbling with his muck-rake among butchers and bakers, beefsteaks and shoemakers, muttering indignantly, "All fudge! all fudge!"

But our fudgy friend would fain draw a very fine distinction between what is paid for the support of the clergy and the incidental expenses of a Parish, and what is paid for the support of the poor, for missions, and other objects. The former he considers as on a par with all other secular business and debts to tradesmen (except when paid in "a right-spirit;") and the other he reckons as alms, charity, offerings, &c. And he is perfectly correct (to say nothing of the exception "in a right-spirit") when the former is paid from pew-rents, and the latter from free-gifts offered on Free-Church principles. But, in order that he may be thoroughly consistent with other parts of his Article, he offers no proofs of this right position, except such as are altogether wrong. In corroboration of his position that the support of the clergy is a mere business-debt, he says:

"The tithes that were given to the Jewish Priesthood were not alms. The Jews did not begin to give alms till after they had paid their tithes. And when God says that in the Christian Church 'they that preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel,' He means to put them on the same footing. Their support is not a matter of alms. Alms lie wholly outside of this matter. It is one of the mischiefs of Free Church that it obscures this distinction, not necessarily, perhaps, but certainly in fact. And this we cannot but consider as most pernicious."

We thank our friend heartily for affirming the obligation of tithes; and also for the acknowledgment that the support of the clergy is, at least, on the same footing under the new Dispensation as under the old. This, as far as it goes, is good Free-Church doctrine. But how was it really under the old Law? What did the Israelites pay tithes *for*? What did they get in return? Was each man who paid tithes entitled to monopolize a part of a bench in the Temple, and keep all other people out of it? We trow not! They were paid purely on Free-Church principles, on the sole motive of duty toward

God. To withhold them was to rob God—not to lose the use of a pew. To pay them was to ensure God's blessing upon the work of obedience and faith—not to secure the exclusive use of a pew. And that personal accommodation in the Temple, during the solemn assembly, had any connection with tithes, was never so much as dreamed of by anybody.

But even supposing that such a connection *did* exist, as rigidly as the connection in our day between pew-rent and pews; what of it? How does it apply in aid of the pew-system? There is not a pewed Church in the world that has adopted as its tariff of prices, that each pew-holder shall pay a *tithe of his income*; and our friend knows it. If "the same footing" prevails at all then, it would only prove that pewed Churches do *no alms at all*. For alms, we are told, do not begin to be reckoned, until after the tithes have been paid. And where is the pewed Church to be found, whose pew-rents, alms, and all other contributions put together, fully amount to the honest *tithes* of its pew-holders? Indeed, greatly as we detest the *exclusiveness* of the pew-system, we would almost be willing to endure it, if the pew-rent demanded, and paid, was a full tithe of the pew-holders' income. But there is no more danger of that, than of their building pewed Churches as costly and as splendid as Solomon's Temple.

But let us see if we can find any true reason for this sharp distinction between the "debt" of supporting a clergyman, (which, we are told, has nothing of alms, or benevolence, or charity, about it,) and that which is given for the support of the poor and other Church objects. Is the one a duty of obligation, and the other a work of *supererogation*? But let us quote once more. Speaking of supporting the Clergy by the offertory, he says:

"Are the Clergy willing to be put upon the footing of pensioners, men who live upon alms! If that be the place assigned them by their Master, they ought to be content with it, and believe it the best. But it is not; and they do no justice to themselves or to Him in fostering a system in which such a falsehood exists. The general obligations of benevolence, unhappily, set lightly upon men. And if the Clergy allow themselves to fall into a position of standing mendicancy in society, ill paid already, they will soon be paid worse. We shall have a class of clerical Trullibers, &c. . . . For, talk about spirituality and unworldliness as much as you please, men will be men; the demand will regulate the supply, and in quality as well as quantity."

Now it is of no use to be merely fighting about words. If *alms* be used in its rigidly etymological meaning, as derived from the Greek word *ἐλεημοσύνη*,—something given from a feeling of *pity* for one in distress,—then that word is inapplicable to the current support of the clergy, (although if we were

maliciously disposed, we would add, that we have known quite a number of clergymen, starving on the pew-system, who *were* fairly entitled to *pity* by reason of their distress.) But used as denoting, not only "alms" proper, but also the "other devotions of the people,"—all, in other words, that is contemplated in the Offertory,—the distinction is at once seen to be groundless. And this enlarged meaning is evidently the one intended by our friend, for it is the *supporting the clergy by the Offertory* that he is so bitterly complaining of, as reducing them to "a position of standing mendicancy in society." But on looking at the subjects included in the Offertory sentences, as those for which the people should then give, we find that, of the twenty verses, only six are specially devoted to the poor, sick, and needy; and these six mostly at the latter end; while the other fourteen are devoted to general exhortations to liberality in good works, and prominent among them are several specially devoted to the duty of *supporting the clergy*:—the very thing which we are told, is no more a part of a man's alms, than his butcher's bill. And this duty is enjoined, not according to our friend's way of thinking. We do not read, "Let every pewholder pay his pew-rent for the support of his minister: lest his pew be rented to another;" but rather, "Let him that is taught in the word minister unto him that teacheth in all good things. *Be not deceived. God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap.*" That does not sound much like the professional whine of a "standing mendicant in society." It is Free-Church doctrine; because there is the place in which the advocates of Free-Churches found their doctrine. And if, fresh from the inspired sublimity of the Offertory, you wish to see the perfect flatness and even skeptical tone that is produced by the pew-system, read our friend's brief way of getting rid of Scripture:

"Talk about *spirituality* and *unworldliness* as much as you please, men will be men; the demand will regulate the supply, and in quality as well as quantity."

From which we infer, that his pew-Church experience inclines him to doubt the very existence of any such things as "spirituality" and "unworldliness":—which is a very natural result of a pew-Church experience. It proves, also, that the reason why there is no "supply" of those useful articles, must be that, under the pew-system, there is no "demand" for them:—which is just what we have always maintained. And we have also a right to infer, that as the demand upon this "spirituality" and "unworldliness" is great and incessant on the Free-Church plan, the "supply" will be regulated accordingly; and

will also be abundant in "quantity," as well as excellent in "quality." All of which conclusions, inasmuch as they were certainly never intended by our friend, may safely be relied upon as correct.

But perhaps this mixing up the support of the clergy, as only one among the multitude of good works which a Christian is called on to do, and as standing on the same general yet high grounds of duty with the rest, is characteristic only of our modern days, and our modern Offertory. So our friend would seem to think. He says,—“It remained for *modern* times to find out that a pastor's compensation is a charity.” We might remind him that the increase of the tithing year in Israel was to be given, not to the Priests alone. There was no such distinction made of old between God's ministers and God's poor. But that increase was given “unto the Levite, the *stranger*, the *fatherless*, and the *widow*.” All are mentioned together repeatedly—the Levite first, indeed, but the others are also added. Our friend, himself, however, knows admirably how to correct in one place the error of another; for, not four pages distant from this charge of modernism, he gives an account of the Offertory in the Primitive Church, and its variety in abundance; and adds—with his wonted easy and unconscious success in contradicting himself—“We do not intend to blink *the fact* that the clergy were supported out of these contributions, . . . and other Church expenses provided for from the same source. Bingham says that one-fourth was given to the Bishop, one-fourth to the inferior Clergy, one to furnish and repair the Church, and one to relieve the poor.” If, after this very conclusive contradiction of the *modernism* of this practice, our readers would like to see our friend contradict himself back again, they need only turn to the page next before our last quotation, and they will read: “That the specific arrangement which the friends of Free-Churches contend for, prevailed in the beginning—Free-seats, public collections on occasions of worship, for their own expenses, &c., *is not certain*.” That will do! He does not intend to blink *the fact*, and he proves the fact to *be* a fact; but, nevertheless,—notwithstanding,—this “fact” is “*not certain*!”

In our days, the dignity of the Clergy is not likely to be easily lowered, so long as it can be helped. Neither Clergy nor laity like the idea. And it is, at first, a suggestion likely to carry weight with many, that the Free-Church plan would reduce the ministry to a position of “standing mendicancy” in society. But let us compare the two modes a little more closely, and see which it is that really degrades the Clergy.

The Free-Church plan calls on the people to give for the support of their minister, because God hath so ordained, because whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap, because what is given to the clergy is, in fact, given to Christ Himself; for He said,—“He that receiveth you, receiveth me.” But, “No,” says our friend, “good people do not give because God hath ordained it, or because what is given to them is given to Him, or from any feeling of Faith, or Love to the Lord Jesus. If you give in that manner, you will be reducing your clergy to the ignoble position of standing beggars in society. I will tell you a far better way than that. Treat your minister *precisely as if he were a butcher, or baker, or shoemaker. That is the true way to elevate the clergy!*”

But our friend is altogether correct in contending that there is a radical difference between pew-rents and offerings. He has not happened to hit on the right way of explaining it, indeed; but if he had not wholly overlooked a very prominent point in our July Article, he might have come somewhere near the truth. The principles upon which the two payments are made, are directly antagonistical. The principle of Free-Church offerings is, to give for the love of Jesus, and from a sense of duty to God, and to carry forward His Kingdom among men. The whole spirit of the Free-Church system is, therefore, to say *Come*, to everybody.

The pew-system, on the contrary, does *not* ask a man for pew-rent as a duty to God, but as a business debt due to a butcher or baker. And the specific object for which the payment is made, is, not to say *Come* to anybody; but to purchase the right to say “*Don't come here,*” to any and everybody who may try to get into his pew. This is what makes the two kinds of payments the contradictory opposites of one another. And therefore pew-rents, no matter in what *spirit* they are paid, are not, and cannot be made to appear, as free-will offerings in any sense of the term. Our friend is scientifically accurate, therefore, in putting these pew-rents, morally and spiritually, among shoemakers' and grocers' bills—where they belong. And there we are perfectly willing to leave them.

Our friend doubts whether the Free-Church system is well fitted for Parochial purposes; and refers to our own expressed sense of some difficulties in its present operation among us. It will be time enough to say more on this point when we are sufficiently advanced in the discussion to reach that part of our subject. Meanwhile, we would remind him that we derive our parochial system very largely from the Church of England, where all the seats are free *by law*. The Church of England

is, indeed, largely supported by tithes; but the payment of tithes has no connection with a *quid pro quo* in the way of *sale or rent of seats* in the House of God. It is a charge upon landed property; and is, so far as it goes, and in theory at least, basing the support of the Church upon the ability of the giver. There is not a Parish in England where the *abuse* of private property in pews has crept in, that has not suffered most severely for it; pews in the Parish Church often doing more to build up and fill the dissenting Chapels, than all other causes put together.

This blighting result has been felt also among us, and felt very strongly, although its full virus has been very extensively weakened by the Free-Church *dilutions*, of which we have spoken. And it is by the aid of these *dilutions*, that Churches, which profess to be conducted wholly on the Pew-system, enjoy a flourishing growth, to the credit of which that *system*, as we have abundantly proved, has no shadow of claim. Our friend, indeed, ignores our argument on that point, and takes credit for all these dilutions as if they sprung naturally from his own system. He is pardonable, however, for that system would be so intolerable without them! He tells us of a Pew-Parish, for instance, where within a few years a new Church has been built costing \$60,000, a lot has been purchased and means raised for a Parsonage, and contributions to objects out of the Parish now amount to nearly \$1,800 a year. How much of these large sums was raised from the *pew-rents*? And if not raised from pew-rents or pew-sales, what credit can the pew-system claim for the result?

Our statement of the evils wrought by the pew-system, and even as felt among us in spite of all these dilutions, our friend considers entirely too strong. He calls it "ridiculous," and "rodomontade," and respectfully adds, "what the man means, we cannot imagine." He protests, "we know of nothing that at all answers to his descriptions. Our whole experience is a contradiction of them, indeed. We meet this part of the Article by a *flat denial of the whole representation*." After this "flat denial of the whole representation," it is the most natural thing in the world—seeing that the denial comes from our friend—to find him kindly contradicting it again on the very next page. "That there is *sterility* and *feebleness* in the Church, we know," he tells us; and pray what else did we say, excepting only that our mode of expression was not quite so tame? He is welcome to all the difference between the phrases which he can discover or invent; but he will hardly be able to show that the "*sterility* and *feebleness*" which he admits, are "a

flat denial of the whole representation" of "blight and barrenness" which he denounces as so totally destitute of truth. His only reference to specific facts in this connection, is to the great and prosperous growth of the Church in Connecticut. No one can honor that sturdy and thriving Diocese more than we do; but when we are expected to give more weight to the experience of Connecticut, than to that of all Christendom besides, we must beg to be excused. Nay, we would ask our friend to remember his admission, that "the pew-system is *not* adapted to the purposes of Church-extension;" and he will then be compelled to admit also, that, great as has been the growth of Connecticut on the pew-system, it would have been *far greater on the other*.

We are accused also of "making" our "facts." Now the great facts upon which we laid the main burden of our argument, are patent upon the History of the Church. The Free-Church plan was, as we showed, the mode in which she had gained all her great conquests, from the preaching in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, down to our own day. And the pew-system, from its rise in England, we proved to have been a blight upon the best energies of our Mother-Church. We can hardly suppose *these* to be the facts so stoutly denied; for our friend admits that "the pew-system is not well adapted to the purposes of Church extension;" that our "argument in support of this position is quite conclusive;" and that he "entirely agrees with us." His impeachment of our facts must therefore refer only to the facts which concern the present state of things among us. The "sterility and feebleness" he admits, in general terms. But our enumeration of statistics as to the present degree of success attained in various Free-Churches throughout the Union, he cannot endure. He admits that he is "very skeptical about statistics." He even seems to suspect that he is an "unpardonable unbeliever." And his estimate of himself is correct. Notwithstanding the abundant evidence we then laid before him, he says:—"We are, to-day, without satisfactory evidence of a single well-established, self-supporting, permanently flourishing Free Church. We have read a great many fine stories, but we have *never yet* found one that would bear examination." . . . "So far as we have made discoveries, they indicate in *every* instance either *falsehood* or *failure*." That is strong talk. It ought to be well sustained, or it ought not to be indulged in. Let us see how it is justified; and, for the sake of brevity, we will intercalate our running commentary in brackets:—"Look at our Free Churches. We mean to speak respectfully but plainly. 'The Holy Com-

munion,' New York, is an endowed Church, [It is no such thing. It has not the endowment of a dollar's worth of property of any kind,] and to a large extent, moreover, practically a Pewed-Church, [It is in *no* respect practically a Pewed Church,] and a fashionable Church. [This last phrase is simply an unamiable way of admitting that a Free-Church may be made successful, and even attractive, to some "respectable" people. It has been a prevailing superstition in some quarters, that a Free-Church was only "good enough for the poor." Not more than *one-tenth* of the communicants of that Church deserve the epithet of rich or "fashionable."] We have no wish to disparage its excellence or its usefulness. [Then why do it?] It deserves all honor. [Our friend takes rather a queer way of rendering "honor unto whom honor."] But it is *not* a demonstration of the success of the Free-Church system. [Then what does it demonstrate the *success* of?] 'The Church of the Advent,' in Boston, is undoubtedly a very flourishing organization. [*That is a fact.*] But it is an incorporation of twelve men, [What of it?] some of them among the wealthiest and most influential of the city, [Well, and what of *that*? Does a Free-Church cease to be a Free-Church because "some" rich and influential men belong to it? We have always claimed that in a Free-Church, "high and low, *rich* and *poor*, one with another," were equal before the Lord, and we have no idea that Free seats are to *exclude* the rich as effectually as Pews exclude the poor. Or does our friend imagine that all the rich and influential people in the Church must, of right, worship only in pews?] and has thus far lived under the healthy irritation of an opposition which has wonderfully quickened its activity and zeal. [This is a backhanded way of admitting that this Free-Church has lived and flourished under a proscription which would have *crushed* any other parish.] Some of these Churches have rich ministers, [the most of them have not;] good and devoted men, we gladly admit, but men with whom the system is a pet, [Is not the *Pew*-system "a pet" with our friend?] with whom income is of little or no consideration, and who, *perhaps*, are the largest contributors to the funds they gather. [*Gratis dictum.*] Others have in them some one or two wealthy laymen, who act the part of patrons, and stand ever ready to make up deficiencies. [That is to say, the system induces some, even of *rich* men, to give "according to their ability,"—a touch of the "sublime" which our friend so ironically ridicules in another place.] Others are aided continually by a stronger parish in the same place, on which they either hang as an appendage, or which looks upon them as charitable establishments for the

poor." [This is, we believe, the position occupied by the Free-Church enterprises in Connecticut. This kind of Free-Churches—being in fact a mere travesty upon the true idea,—is known in other parts of the Church, by the deserved *soubriquet* of *Kitchen Church*, or *Church of Saint Lazarus*. Its root idea is the permanent *separation* of the rich and poor—those two classes whom it is the object of the Free-Church plan to *bring together*. The one proclaims that these different classes of society shall not worship God even in the same building; the other admits them both, on a perfect equality, upon the same floor. The Free-Church movement is responsible, neither in principle nor in practice, for these establishments which are only, like the soup in *Oliver Twist*, "Very good for the poor?"—though even of them, in that they do good where none would else be done, we might well "ask for more," as Oliver did of the soup. But these Churches are not doing what the true principle demands. They are only the reluctant, clumsy and often penurious *excuses* of rich parishes for *not* doing it.] "Some flourish for a time while the novelty lasts, and then droop and disappear, or become Pewed Churches. Cases of the latter sort are not infrequent. Our eye now falls on the following:—'The Rev. Mr. Ingraham, we learn from the *Mobile Register*, has been forced to resign his rectorship of St. John's Church. It may be remembered that this Church was built as a *Free Church*, and that the Rector was to be supported by the free gifts of the congregation, taken up every Sunday morning, during the reading of the *Offertory*. This has failed. Hence the Rector has felt himself compelled to resign.'" Now in regard to this story about St. John's, *Mobile*, being a "Free-Church failure," we must call our readers' attention to a nice little bit of poetical justice. In our July Article we gave statistics of quite a number of Free-Churches, all of which came to us, in manuscript, either from the clergyman of each Church himself, or from some one of his most prominent and reliable laymen. Better, or more authentic, information of this kind, is not to be had. It is evidence sufficient for a reasonable man, as far as it goes. Yet our friend doubts the whole of it; denies that we have given satisfactory evidence of a single well-established case; declares that not a single one would bear examination; and boldly asserts that his "discoveries" "indicate, in every instance, either falsehood or failure." After thus summarily sweeping away a mass of evidence, all of a respectable kind, and of which, during the space of five months, not a single portion has been proved to be incorrect; what facts does our friend give us on the other side, as to Free-Church failures? Not a single one, except the above

story about St. John's, Mobile; and *that* he swallowed whole from an anonymous newspaper paragraph, without any authentic voucher at all. And the beauty of the poetic justice consists in the fact, that his October Article had hardly been read in type, before an authentic contradiction of that same anonymous paragraph, under the names of perfectly responsible persons, appeared in every Church paper which had copied the account of the *Free-Church failure*. Our friend's charity is of that sort which "believeth all things," *against* Free-Churches, as a matter of course, even without proof, or against proof; but in favor of them, no evidence is sufficient to convince him; he is willingly and conscientiously, an "unpardonable unbeliever." We are sorry, however, that in the above case, we have had to look elsewhere for the contradiction of the story. We are satisfied that this was only owing to the early, and perhaps hasty, preparation of his Article. We doubt not—judging from his readiness in that line—that with a little more time, our friend would instinctively and cheerfully have contradicted the story himself.

But it is time for us to take credit to the Free Church cause, for the admissions made by our friend; and we have the greater right to claim them at their full value, because they are wrung out of him with such evident reluctance on his part, that he contradicts pretty much every one of them almost as soon as it is made. Thus he speaks highly of the Free-Church plan, as being in fact "the Church acting aggressively upon the world." He declares that Free-Churches "are admirable missionary organs on new ground and in populous places." Yet on another page we read that "The Free-Church system is *inapplicable*, in its full development, to the Church, even in its *aggressive* movements." He admits that it "pertains properly to the Church's external aggressive life," and yet, that it will remove the "sterility and feebleness" of which he complains, he "fearlessly denies." He thinks "its theories to a large extent, impracticable, its purposes Utopian, its zeal sometimes Quixotic." "In the full latitude of its pretensions and expectations," he assures us, "it will prove a bubble that will soon break and disappear. As such it will only be known in that immense repertory of impracticable projects which the Church lays up for the amusement of curious antiquarians—amidst ingenious whirligigs that cannot be made to go, and perpetual motions that have ceased to move, . . . labeled,—The Free-Church *Dream* of the Nineteenth Century." As to the threatened label which the Free-Church plan is to bear in our friend's antiquarian museum, we would only remind him that "Behold, this *dreamer*

cometh!" has been said once before: and we think that the omen is rather favorable than otherwise to the realization of the dream. "Joseph," moreover, signifies *increase*: and Joseph *did* increase, notwithstanding the ridicule with which his brethren treated his "Dream."

But, on the other hand, our friend says some very handsome things of this Utopian "bubble" and Quixotic "Dream." He declares that the Church owes it a considerable debt. "It has done good, and is doing good We have no doubt the Church needed it, and that in its origin it was a symptom of life, the outspeaking of an irrepressible conviction. It stands among us the witness for great truths and solemn obligations, too long slumbered over and neglected. It testifies to the spiritual equality of men, and the rights of God's poor, too much forgotten, too little cared for. [On a previous page he had undertaken to show that poor men have a *better* chance at equality with the rich in a Pewed-Church, than in one that is Free!] It has done much to awaken attention to them, and call forth efforts in their behalf. We trust it will do yet more. . . . It has truth in it, and important truth,—truth too little thought of, and earnest and able friends who will do with it all that can be done." And at the very beginning of the Article, we find the following:—

"The writer in the [July] Article under consideration, tells us that *the Pew-System is not well adapted to the purposes of Church extension*; and his argument in support of this position is quite conclusive. We entirely agree with him. His doctrine is true. But we cannot discover its relevancy. We are not discussing the Church's Missionary, but her parochial work. What it is wise or necessary for her to do in the effort to enlarge her borders, and bring men within her pale, is one thing. But how she shall conduct the affairs of her settled congregations and parishes, so as to provide her members most steadily and effectually with the means of spiritual improvement and edification, is a totally different question. . . . The two departments of operation are quite distinct. The one is the Church acting aggressively upon the world; the other is the Church engaged in the work of internal training and discipline, building up her own children in their most Holy Faith, and nourishing them unto eternal life. What may be a wise and useful system, or even a necessity, in the one, may be most inappropriate and hurtful in the other."

Now we might begin by asking how it is that the "means of *spiritual* improvement and edification," and "the work of internal training and discipline," the "building up her own children in their most Holy Faith, and nourishing them unto eternal life,"—we might ask how all this is to be obtained out of the difference between free-seats and seats rented or sold? "We cannot discover its relevancy." The *better support of the Clergy*, we have heard claimed for the Pew-system; but that pew-

rents were going to supply such an abundance of *spiritual* aliment to the people, "building them up in the Faith," and "nourishing them unto eternal life," (especially remembering about the butcher, baker, and beef-steak,) we confess we never suspected before, and do not very clearly understand now.

The distinction between Missionary and Parochial work seems to be plausible. But let us look at it for a moment, and see whether any such rigid separation actually exists, or is indeed possible, where the Church is a *living* thing. Free seats are confessed to be "necessary in the effort to enlarge her borders;" and where is the *Parish* whose "borders" are incapable of further enlargement? Free-seats are confessed to be necessary "to bring men within her *pale*;" and where is the Parish in which there are *no* men yet to be brought within her pale? The Free-seat system is confessed to be "the Church acting aggressively upon the world;" and where is the Parish in which there is nothing more left of "the world," for the Church to conquer? Show us such a Parish—nay, in addition to the above impossible requirements, show us the Parish where no more young couples are to be married, and no more children to be born, and no further increase in the Church population is to be expected by emigration or otherwise; and then and there we will grant that there is a Parish where the Pew-system will not hinder the growth of the Church—simply because any further growth would then and there be impossible. There is no city, nor town, nor village, in all this land, sufficiently *finished* to answer the conditions of the hypothesis. Everywhere there are new families rising up, or moving in; everywhere there are Dissenters, Romanists, Worldlings, Nothingarians, Infidels, and blasphemers, to be converted and gathered unto the growing Fold. Everywhere Church-extension is possible, and it is therefore everywhere the first practical duty.

And yet our friend *grants* that "the Pew-system is *not* well adapted to the purposes of Church extension." Our argument he declares to be "quite conclusive." He "entirely agrees" with us. Our "doctrine is true." *That admission settles the whole question.* It is *not* the providing of spiritual edification to the people, it is *not* the building up of the Church's children in our most Holy Faith, it is *not* the nourishing the flock unto eternal life, that is the main charm of the Pew-system in the eyes of its friends. It is the "regular and reliable support" of the ministry—it is the "reliable contracts" with the vestry for salary—that with them so decisively

outweigh all the superior efficacy of Free-seats in the glorious work of Church-extension. They are willing that the work should stagnate; so that the clerical oxen may only grow fat in their stalls. They would demoralize or disband whole regiments of the rank and file in the armies of the Church militant, so that they may only double the rations and multiply the perquisites of the officers. They cry out that the wheels of the conqueror's chariot shall be stayed in mid career of victory; in order that His hungry body-guard may fly upon the spoil.

It is not thus that we have learned the relative importance of the Bread of Life, and the Loaves and Fishes. *Growth*—not “a regular and reliable salary”—is the first great law of practical life in the Church. “Preach the Gospel to every creature,” and “in all lands,” is the command. “Let him that heareth say Come.” The constant daily public and private prayer of all Christians everywhere is, *Thy Kingdom come*: and it is their duty to act it as well as pray it. We know, moreover, that before that “end come,” the Gospel must first “be preached in *all the world* for a witness unto all nations.” “Increase and multiply,” is the great command of the new creation under the second Adam, as well as to the old creation under the first Adam. It was therefore that we said before, and now repeat,—“To increase, to multiply, to grow, to gather in—this is the chief work the Church is ordained to do. She is the great treasure-house of God's grace, and she must draw all men unto her, that they may receive of Christ and be saved. Growth by the Spirit; growth by the Bride; growth by the Ministry; growth by the voluntary labors of the laity; growth by the spontaneous coming of “whosoever will,” that he may take the water of life *freely*; this is the one prime, all-controlling, all-overwhelming instinct; the indispensable and ineradicable *law of life*, to the Church of the living God. This must be obeyed *first*, no matter what else may be postponed or neglected. It is impossible that any *practical* consideration can ever, under any circumstances, be for an instant weighed against it. Whatever clashes with this, therefore, must be done away. Whatever impedes it must be cut asunder. Whatever smothers out the life of it, must itself be destroyed.”

The admission, then, that “the Pew-system is *not* well adapted to the purposes of Church-extension,”—that “the argument is *quite conclusive*,”—that “the doctrine is *true*,”—is *fatal to the advocates of pews*.” Any further defense of their system is a simple impossibility. There is nothing more to be said. *Causa finita est.*

Only one word more, and, for this time at least, we are done. Our friend is rather free in his use of words. "Quixotic rage," "moon-struck," "all fudge," "merest nonsense," "falsehood," "rodomontade," and similar phrases, are perhaps not the most persuasive amenities in a friendly discussion. But they call for no reply, and hardly for this brief and quiet notice. They stir in us no unpleasant feeling, and no desire for unhandsome retort. Nay, we find it easy to look with good-natured unconcern upon hard words which are only used as a *sauce piquante* for arguments that are so soft, for self-contradictions that are both plentiful and palpable, and for admissions which kindly and completely cover the whole ground in dispute.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY APPLIED TO THE CONDITION, THE RESOURCES, AND THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. By FRANCIS BOWEN, Alford Professor of Moral Philosophy and Civil Polity, in Harvard College. Boston: Little, Brown & Company. 1856. 8vo. pp. 546.

As we propose to discuss the subject treated of in this volume at some length in our next No., we simply announce the work here, and add a few remarks upon its design and character.

Political Economy is comparatively a modern science; and is undoubtedly one of the most important sciences of modern times. There is indeed a sense in which it may be called the *theology* of our age; for no deity is worshiped more sedulously than Mammon; and Political Economy is regarded by most men, and in its practical phase, as the science of wealth, and its acquisition. Even in this point of view alone, a work on this subject would be deserving of, as it most certainly would receive, careful and considerate attention.

But it is not for this purpose, nor in this view of it that we have called Political Economy one of the most important sciences of modern times. Not only is it concerned with, and the science of, the material well-being of a community, but so intimately connected is this well-being with many of the deepest questions of polity and of civilization itself, that to it, we must look for a solution of many of the most important and fundamental problems of the future. The social position of the laboring classes—the possibility of civil liberty and political equality, all depend upon questions embraced and discussed within the province of Political Economy.

Professor Bowen has undertaken and executed his task, in no mere spirit of a book-making trade; but apparently with a full appreciation of the momentous interests with which he is dealing. He has entered upon the work in a spirit of calm philosophic insight into the nature of man and of society, and has prosecuted it with a most patient and diligent investigation of the facts and statistics by which his conclusions must be determined. It is in a general view of it, the best general treatise on the subject that has yet been published. It states with ample fullness and the most perfect fairness the great theories of Adam Smith, of Ricardo, and of Malthus, on free trade, rent and population, and answers them in a way, which if it do not prove satisfactory to the reader—as we think it will—will nevertheless present him the grounds upon which to form his own opinions. He has also discussed at great length the theory of money, of paper currency, and of banking, though in our opinion the discussions on this point are not quite so satisfactory as those on the preceding.

As a text book for schools and Colleges it may be thought somewhat too large and full. But if so, it will be only the more satisfactory for the private student and the better adapted to his wants. The fact that the Prof. has had our own country, its resources, institutions, and its experience always in view and drawn his facts and illustrations from that source to so great an extent, will be found to give to the work an additional and peculiar value.

One criticism alone have we to make. It is this: that while the Author has shown great familiarity with every European writer of any note, whether English or Continental, he has not that we recollect so much as once noticed our own countryman, HENRY C. CAREY. This seems a strange omission, not only on account of Mr. Carey's European reputation, but for the reason that he has devoted especial attention to those European theories of Smith, Ricardo, Malthus and Say, which Professor Bowen feels called upon either

to refute altogether or to show to be inapplicable to this country. We have been accustomed to regard Mr. Carey's as one of the great names in the science of Political Economy, and one that will stand hereafter only second to that of Adam Smith, and second even to his, only because he was the founder of the science. We think he is beginning to be so regarded in Europe also. It can hardly be possible that Prof. Bowen does not know how nearly he agrees with Mr. Carey on many of the most important points of his theories. And yet there are several places in Prof. Bowen's work where we have fancied that his own statements would have been somewhat improved if he had possessed as much familiarity with the writings of our countryman, Carey, as with his British and European authorities. But, as it is, we consider it the best work yet published, and as such commend it to the public.

RELIGION IN AMERICA; or an Account of the Origin, Relation to the State, and present condition of the Evangelical Churches in the United States. With Notices of the Unevangelical Denominations. By ROBERT BAIRD. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 8vo. pp. 696. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

This is in all respects a curious book, and in some respects one of considerable value. In a country where the government tolerates all religions, it is an important question, What is the present *status* of Religion? Which of all the various forms of Religion is most in accordance with our civil Institutions? Which is best suited to the genius of our people? Which is advancing most rapidly? &c., &c. The author, the Rev. Dr. Baird, is and has been for many years connected with the "Evangelical Alliance" movement, and has for the last twenty years resided much of the time on the Continent of Europe. This large portly volume has grown out of a desire in Europe to know something of the condition of Religion in the United States, which seems to be regarded both as an enigma and a bugbear; and from a small work the volume has increased to its present dimensions. It has attracted much attention in Great Britain, especially among the Dissenters; and a former edition was translated into French, German, Swedish, and Dutch, and was extensively circulated all over the continent of Europe. The present movement among ourselves looking toward the great doctrine of the Unity of the whole Body of Christ, can never be discussed intelligently without just such information as this volume proposes to give; and, in fact, the "Evangelical Alliance," so called, is but another attempt to attain a similar important end, though upon an entirely different basis. There is probably no man living who has devoted so much attention as Dr. Baird to an examination of the present condition of the religious denominations in the United States, and the book abounds in information which can hardly be found anywhere else; as will be seen from the account of its contents. It will be noticed that he makes no mention whatever of some scores of Sects with which our country swarms; nor does he stop to ask, over this heterogeneous mass,—"Is Christ divided?" But he does name the more important denominations, and, by a standard of his own, divides them off into "Evangelical" and "Non-Evangelical." The Contents are as follows:

The First Book is devoted to preliminary remarks, &c.

The Second Book treats of the early colonization of the country now forming in the United States, the religious character of the first European colonists—their Ecclesiastical institutions—and the state of the "Churches" when the Revolution took place by which the Colonies became independent of the mother country.

The Third Book treats of the changes involved in and consequent upon that event—the influences of those changes—the character of the civil governments of the States—and the relations subsisting between these Governments and the "Churches."

The Fourth Book exhibits the operations of the Voluntary System in the United States—and the extent of its influence.

The Fifth Book treats of the Discipline of the "Churches"—the character of American preaching—and the subject of Revivals.

The Sixth Book is occupied with brief notices of the Evangelical denominations in the United States—their Ecclesiastical polity and discipline—the doctrines peculiar to each, their history and prospects. In this class, he includes Protestant Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Moravians, Dutch and German Reformed, Lutherans, and Quakers.

The Seventh Book treats in like manner of the non-evangelical sects; and in this class, he places the Roman Catholics, Unitarians, Christians, Universalists, Swedenborgians, Jews, Rappists, Shakers, Mormons, Atheists, Deists, Socialists, Fourierists, &c.

The Eighth Book shows what "the Churches" are doing in the way of sending the Gospel to other lands.

Dr. Baird has evidently endeavored to write with entire fairness; and his account of the "Protestant Episcopal Church," though grossly inaccurate sometimes, is, on the whole, as favorable as could have been anticipated. He thinks that more than half of our *thirty-eight* Bishops, and about two-thirds of our 1714 clergy, are "Evangelical;" while "among the laity there is scarcely any sympathy with these semi-popish doctrines;" and that "the progress of Puseyism is much smaller than has been supposed." He concedes the strong position which the Church has gained in the cities and large towns.

Whenever Dr. Baird leaves the *facts*, to discuss the *philosophy* of his history, of course he enters on debatable ground; and there is none more so in the whole field of letters; and here we detect at once his own theological and denominational opinions. Himself nominally an Old School Presbyterian, he dissects and labels through Old School Presbyterian spectacles.

It is impossible that it should have been otherwise. We do not blame him for this; we only speak of it as a feature of his book. Thus his account of the origin of Unitarianism in New England, is that usually given by the "Orthodox;" to wit, that it was the natural fruit of that laxity which had grown out of the "Half-way Covenant," and which was precipitated under the "Revival of 1740" into a formal and visible separation. On the contrary, Unitarianism in New England is one of the natural, and, we may say, necessary fruits of a system of Metaphysical Theology, which has now grown effete. There are other and better fruits of that system, not natural but incidental, yet real and somewhat abundant, to which he has not alluded, and of which we doubt if he has any conception. But Unitarianism has been, to a very large extent, just such a result as we have described; and the process is still going on, and Unitarians are exulting over it. We are sorry to see that Dr. Baird has repeated the old slander on the Church concerning King's Chapel, Boston; a slander which has been again and again exposed. If his book ever reaches another edition, we call upon Dr. Baird, as an honest man, at least to examine that subject more thoroughly. In all matters involving the discussion of theological opinions, the author is to be distrusted. Yet he has given to the public a valuable book, and we thank him for it. As an argument for the "Voluntary System," so called, it will have in Europe great weight. Yet are there two sides to that question; and a large mass of facts pointing in an opposite direction from the object of this book, which do not here appear.

A NEW AND IMPROVED STANDARD FRENCH AND ENGLISH, AND ENGLISH AND FRENCH DICTIONARY, &c., &c. By A. G. COLLOT. Philadelphia: C. G. Henderson & Co. 1856.

A good French Dictionary has been a *desideratum*. Those we had, were either too large or too small, too simple or too complicated. The compilation of Mr. Collet, seems to us, fully and precisely to supply our needs. It is full and yet simple in arrangement in both its parts, satisfactory in definition, and accomplishes, we imagine, as much for pronunciation as can be done without the living teacher.

We have tried it with considerable care, in several points, where we have found other dictionaries insufficient, and it has stood the trial. Its merits ought to insure for it a wide, and for author and publishers, a remunerative circulation.

A valuable addition is the comparative table of Mythological and other names, ancient and modern. We recommend the book without reservation.

POEMS. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, Author of the "Study of Words," etc., etc. New York: Redfield. 1856. 12mo. pp. 336.

Mr. Trench has published several volumes of Poems within the last few years, all of which, we believe, have passed through more than one edition. The Rev. Dr. J. A. Spencer has selected more than half of all his published Poems, and they are embodied in the volume before us. They are all short, several being less than twenty lines, "Genoveva," the longest, and one of the finest, extending to forty pages. This last Poem, "Genoveva," is a versification of a legend of the Middle Ages; and the best of the Poems are those in which Mr. Trench has fashioned anew the traditional romances, tales, and legends of Mediæval and Oriental life. The author, we think, has more true sentiment than poetic genius; and his verses with all their purity and richness of thought, and loftiness of Christian tone, and truthfulness to their subject, are yet often harsh and labored, and lack that musical and easy flow which bespeaks a truly poetic ear. In this judgment, we differ from high authority; but we yield to none in our respect for his rare talents and capabilities, and in our estimate of the vast good which he is accomplishing by his learned writings. Neither is the success of his Poems at the present day to be regarded as sufficient proof of their high poetic merit. When such miserable stuff as "Maud,"

"Dismally dull and dolefully dawdlin,"

can be sent forth by the "Poet Laureate," we may well conclude that the stream of Poesy in England runs decidedly low. The Boston "*Examiner*," (Unitarian,) speaks of Trench as belonging to the "Broad" School; an imputation, as understood by the *Examiner*, wholly undeserved. It is noticeable, with what avidity these persons catch at any intimation that men are growing radical, and untruthful to their principles.

WESTWARD EMPIRE; OR, THE GREAT DRAMA OF HUMAN PROGRESS. By E. L. Magoon, Author of "Proverbs for the People," "Republican Christianity," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856.

The author of this volume informs us in the preface, that "the philosophy of history resides not in isolated events and detached facts, but flows without interruption down the lapse of ages, the accompaniment of human destiny and the life of ennobling actions;" also, that "fortunately the tide of improvement has already rolled onward so far, and with such increased might, that Oxford is just as impotent to stay the ameliorating progress of mankind, as was the Vatican," a piece of information by which we feel greatly relieved; also, that "all great revolutions in the intellectual world are marked by successive steps of generalization and transitions into wider realms through more expanded truths;" also, that "four mighty landmarks rise prominently to view, around which are concentrated *all* the beneficent institutions, and renowned names, universally admired by the civilized world."

It is only necessary to add, that these four landmarks, are, Pericles! Augustus Cæsar!! Leo X!!! and Washington; concerning the first three of whom this is certainly a discovery; and that in chasteness of style, clearness of expression, profundity of thought, and a good many other things, the volume quite fulfills the brilliant promise of the preface.

SINAI AND PALESTINE, IN CONNECTION WITH THEIR HISTORY. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, M. A., Canon of Canterbury. With Maps and Plans. New York: Redfield. New Haven: S. Babcock. 1856. 8vo. pp. 535.

We were prepared by notices of the English edition of Mr. Stanley's work to see a scholarly and reliable contribution to our literature, descriptive of the Holy Land. Mr. Redfield's edition more than justifies our high anticipation. The learned will search this volume to decide contested points of famous localities, although this was not the main design of the work; Christian divines will read it, to see new light and fresh beauty flash upon the historical, prophetic and devotional portions of the Old Testament. And Christian hearts will follow him as, step by step, he describes places, sacred with the memories, and hallowed by the footsteps, of the adorable Son of God. Mr. Stanley made it a point to omit no geographical feature which throws any direct light on the history or the poetry of the Sacred Volume; and, on the other hand, to insert no descriptions except those which have such a purpose. The Maps present not merely the physical features, but the actual coloring offered to the eye of the traveler. He has aimed at greater precision in the use of geographical terms than has been attempted in our authorized Version, and has thrown into an Appendix a catalogue of such words as a help in philological and geographical study. The work contains seven Maps—1st, a diagram of Egypt, Sinai and Palestine; 2d, Egypt; 3d, Peninsula of Sinai; 4th, Traditional Sinai; 5th, Palestine; 6th, South of Palestine; 7th, Plain of Esdraelon and Galilee. After an introductory sketch of Egypt, fragmentary and rapid, yet graphic, Mr. Stanley enters the Holy Land, and proceeds with a most minute description of every point of interest: its geography and physical features, its hills and valleys and plains, its lakes and rivers and fountains, its towns and villages, its sacred localities, sacred and profane history, &c. &c. It should be mentioned, also, that Mr. Stanley, who visited Egypt, Arabia and Syria in the winter of 1852 and the spring of 1853, had before him the "Researches" of our own distinguished traveler, Dr. Robinson, and also M. de Sauley's "Journey in Syria," two of the ablest late works on these sacred localities. He is, besides, a most thorough Biblical and Classical scholar; and his copious foot notes show that he has passed nothing by, ancient or modern, bearing upon his subject.

We have been thus particular in giving the contents of this volume, because it is one which the Clergy, Biblical students, Sunday School teachers, and intelligent Christians, will welcome with pleasure. It is also a delightful book to read. So far from being dull, even old scenes attract us with new beauty under the author's fresh and vigorous style, while the heart is warmed with the devout tone which pervades the work, and with its constant reference to the sacred Volume.

Mr. Redfield has issued the volume in a neat and tasteful manner, and at a very moderate price.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES: A Sketch of its Ecclesiastical History. By HENRY DE COURCY. Translated and enlarged by JOHN GILMARY SHEA. New York: Edward Dunigan & Brother. Baltimore: Murphy & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 591.

It will be recollected that in the seventh and eighth Volumes of the Church Review there appeared two Articles on "Maryland Toleration," proving, beyond a doubt, that "Religious Toleration" in Maryland was not a boon granted by Roman Catholics, and that the popular notion on that subject is a miserable *old wives'* fable, without the shadow of a foundation to stand upon. We are aware that these extravagant pretensions in respect to Religious Toleration, claimed alike in behalf of Maryland Roman Catholics and New England Puritans, have received hitherto the popular assent. They have been announced by popular orators, been taught in our public schools out of Protestant Histories, and even Churchmen have fallen in with the popular current, or been branded as

bigots, and held up to public odium; for men when they cannot argue, can still sneer and call hard names. There is, however, already a change in public sentiment on this subject, and Mr. Bancroft's later works are not the only proof of it. For the Articles in the *Church Review*, above alluded to, the (Roman Catholic) *Metropolitan* took us to task, thought we were not particularly amiable, but was very careful to dodge our historical details. The history of the [Roman] Catholic Church in the United States by De Courcy and Shea now before us, on this question of Toleration, gives up the point frankly and fully. The real facts in this case were not precisely as these writers state them, but as to this particular question they are explicit and correct. Here is their language:—"Lord Baltimore had seen too well how the English Catholics were crushed by the Protestants, as soon as they were the strongest and most numerous; he should then have foreseen that it would be so in Maryland, so that the English Catholics, instead of finding liberty in America, only changed their bondage. Instead, then, of admiring the liberality of Lord Baltimore, we prefer to believe that he obtained his charter from Charles I *only on the formal condition of admitting Protestants on an equal footing with Catholics.*" p. 80.

We notice that the Roman Catholic press appreciate the importance and probable influence of this History, and *Brownson* is terribly severe towards its authors, especially M. de Courcy, but he is very cautious not to touch his facts. The History itself is by no means what its title indicates. After an imperfect and superficial sketch of the early settlement of the country and the labors of Romish missionaries, the authors do little more than give a general history of the Dioceses of Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, and New York. Their account of the mission of the Nuncio, Bedini, to this country shows that it was meant as an experiment which proved to be a great mistake. Their history of the Tractarian movement is full of blunders and misstatements. In speaking of the converts to Popery they forget to tell us how many times ex-Bishop Ives recanted, and at last with this deliberate and solemn declaration:—"And further, to declare my conscientious conviction that our branch of the Church, styled 'the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States,' and standing upon the same firm basis with the mother Church in England, belongs to that portion of Christ's body which is the most scriptural, primitive, and truly catholic in its character; and that no one embraced by holy baptism within its pale can depart from it without the grievous sin of doing despite to the Holy Ghost." In another edition they will perhaps explain why some of these "converts" have already found their way back to the true Fold from which for a time they had strayed. While the work before us is by no means reliable or complete, it is yet worth looking at to see what the Romanists have been doing.

THE PURITAN COMMONWEALTH. An Historical Review of the Puritan Government in Massachusetts in its Civil and Ecclesiastical relations, from its rise to the abrogation of the First Charter. Together with some general reflections on the English Colonial Policy, and on the character of Puritanism. By the late PETER OLIVER, of the Suffolk Bar. Boston: Little, Brown & Company. 1856. 8vo. pp. 502.

The readers of the Second, Third, and Fourth Volumes of the *Church Review* will recollect as having appeared in them a series of Articles on the Puritan Commonwealth in Massachusetts. The quiet yet fearless manner in which the writer went forward, uprooting popular notions about the Puritan Colonies, justifying himself, too, at every step by Puritan testimony, his avoidance of abusive epithets, but the sweeping nature of the facts which he marshaled with such cool and determined precision—these are not forgotten we know by many. The publication of the series in the *Review* was then interrupted, when it was less than one third completed. Little did we then know the magnitude of the labors to which the author was devoting himself, or of their importance. It is enough to say, that the whole is now comprised in one large octavo volume with the above title, to which we would invite the attention of the reader. We

do not hesitate to affirm that the work enters, and from a Church stand-point, more thoroughly into an exposition of the genius and spirit of the Puritan Commonwealth than has ever been done before, and with a thoroughness and fullness which must hereafter modify that portion of the Puritan history in the popular mind. The manner in which the Charter of the Massachusetts Bay Company was first obtained; its fraudulent transfer to Massachusetts; the perversion of, and abuses under it; the construction, intolerance, and persecutions of the "Puritan Church;" the Puritan Missions, contrasted with those of Virginia, and the Jesuits; the first dawning of conspiracy among the Puritans, and its causes; and the general history, tone, and temper of Puritanism—these the reader will find thoroughly illustrated. The time has come when we ought to begin to take a broad view of the early settlement of our whole country, and as Churchmen we must be willing, as we can well afford to be, honest and impartial. We urge this work upon our readers, therefore, not that they may gratify a virulent, petty and unmanly prejudice, not for the sake of finding weapons with which to assail Puritanism, but as throwing light upon important public questions of policy, administration, manners, morals and religion, on which there has been abroad an almost inconceivable amount of popular error.

WESTERN AFRICA. Its History, Condition, and Prospects. By Rev. J. LEIGHTON WILSON, Eighteen Years a Missionary in Africa and now one of the Secretaries of the Presbyterian Board of Missions. With numerous Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 527. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

This is the best account of the History, condition and prospects of Western Africa that has been published; it is compendious and yet sufficiently minute for all ordinary purposes. It gives a concise sketch of its ancient Races, and of the two great families, the Ethiopian and the Nigritian; of the early attempts to circumnavigate the continent; of its geographical divisions and features; of the discoveries in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries by the Portuguese, English, French and Dutch; and then a brief description of the principal divisions of the country from Senegambia down to Angola. It also gives a pretty full description of the Colonies at Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Gambia; and discusses the question of the capacity of the Africans for improvement and the best modes of carrying on Christian Missions in Africa. One of the most valuable portions of the book is its historical sketch of Romish Missions in Western Africa, especially in Congo; where at least one hundred Missionaries were sent, where there were probably not less than one hundred consecrated churches, where for two centuries Romanism was the acknowledged religion of the natives, and where it would have been difficult to find one adult who had not been baptized. And what has been the result of all this surprising zeal and liberality! For some of the most learned and accomplished men whom Rome ever sent forth spent their lives in Congo. Now, every trace of Romanism is gone, and the people of Congo are among the most savage, barbarous, and degraded, of all the heathens of Western Africa. The real secret of this failure was that Romanism never gained a hold upon the moral and intellectual nature of the people. It baptized by crowds; it introduced its ceremonies; but yet it only took away one system of Fetichism and gave another; and, after all, left the people where it found them. Its self sacrifices and heroism of endurance might well cause us to blush; and yet Romanism in Congo proved an utter failure, as it did also in Japan, in Southern Asia and in South America. Mr. Wilson pays a well deserved compliment to our own Missions in Liberia, and to the English Church Missions in Sierra Leone.

There are other respects in which this work is important to the statesman; as it indicates, clearly enough, the vast amount of commerce which is sure to be carried on with the western coast of Africa, and which the British government of course are already endeavoring to anticipate.

THE BLEMMERTONS; or Dottings by the Wayside. By the Rev. JOSEPH J. NICHOLSON. New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 423. New Haven: G. B. Bassett & Co.

There is ability and character enough in this book of Mr. Nicholson to produce a sensation. It is full of keen hits of an arrow, sharp, and so well barbed, as to be sure to leave its mark. The work is an out-and-out showing up of that purse-proud patronizing class of people who, thoroughly selfish, and ignorant of the first principles of the Church, yet attempt to snub and browbeat the Clergyman who will not fall down and worship the "golden calf," and who presumes to obey God rather than conform to the unprincipled liberalism of the day. The "Blemmerton Family" represent this modern element in American aristocracy; these vulgar, dashing parvenues, who pay for the best seat in Church, and run off to hear "Dr. Riproarer" and "Dr. Skyrocket" whenever they come in town; who figure largely in all charities but Church charities; and who are terribly afraid of Puseyism. Mr. Nicholson has chosen a rich theme; and as he is a bold man and calls things by their right names, he will probably not be reckoned among those of whom "all men speak well." But his book will do good. It shows not merely the defects, but the positive sinfulness of the system of education in most of our Female Boarding Schools; it exposes the utter heartlessness of much which passes as popular philanthropy; it exhibits the pride, self-will, and supreme selfishness of modern liberalism; it reveals the essential difference in the very conception of personal religion as witnessed in the Church System and in the Revival System; and it depicts in glowing colors the underhanded management, the innate vulgarity and meanness of those busy mischief-makers who, almost always, for a time, dog the steps of the faithful uncompromising Church Minister.

The book has its faults. The picture is sometimes overdrawn. The story has too many episodes. The names of his characters are sometimes too significant to be in good taste. Thus "Mr. Weak in-the-Upper Story" is almost as bad as those ridiculous appendages with which the old Round-heads used to grace their offspring. The tone and temper are not always such as to conciliate those who are only nominal Churchmen, but yet who are often such from ignorance rather than conviction. Still, there is an element in modern society, a selfish, vulgar, supercilious, and mischievous element, which needs to be rebuked; and the story of "The Blemmertons" is well adapted to do it.

CALDERON; HIS LIFE AND GENIUS. With Specimens of his Plays. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, B. D., Author of "The Study of Words," &c. New York: Redfield. 1856. 12mo. pp. 233.

There are few of our readers to whom this volume will not open up a field almost entirely new. The introductory Essay is devoted to an account of the Spanish Drama, and to a sketch of the life, character, and works of Calderon, the greatest Spanish dramatist. Mr. Trench also gives an analysis and a partial translation of two of his dramas, viz, "Life's a Dream," and "The Great Theatre of the World." Mr. Trench says there are but three great original dramatic literatures in the world, the Greek, the English, and the Spanish; and as the noblest and best representative of the Spanish, Calderon came upon the stage when Cervantes had just left it, when Spain had already more than reached the acme of her glory, and he was therefore the last fruit to ripen into full maturity, of a tree which had already begun to decay. For a full sketch of Calderon's life and for an elaborate criticism of his works, as well as for the varied estimate in which he has been held by literary writers, we must refer to the volume itself. It will gratify and reward the study of those who have any true taste for literature.

As Mr. Trench is not to be Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, which appointment it is said he lost by the caprice of a woman, his new position, as successor of Dr. Buckland, will give him, we trust, abundant opportunities to prosecute

those studies by which he has already won an enviable reputation, and not less in our country than in his own.

THE RECENT PROGRESS OF ASTRONOMY; Especially in the United States. By ELIAS LOOMIS, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 396.

This is a third and enlarged edition of the best popular work of Astronomy yet published. The progress of astronomical discovery within the last fifteen years has been very rapid, and the advances made in the United States, both in the facilities for observation and the number of active observers, are in the highest degree gratifying. The Messrs. Professors Bond of Cambridge, Professor Mitchell of Cincinnati, and Professor Loomis of New York, are already associated in reputation with Herschel, and Hind, and Le Verrier, and the cleverest European discoverers. Prof. Loomis' book though scientific is adapted to the capacity of every person of ordinary intelligence; and the success of such a work shows how generally a taste for scientific pursuits is diffused among the American people.

THE HILLS OF THE SHATEMUG. By the Author of the "Wide, Wide World." New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 516. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

They who have read Miss Warner's previous stories have no need to be told that her pen is a fountain of genuine sentiment, pure, fresh and gushing as the limpid waters from her native hills. Here is where her merit chiefly consists, and here is her hold upon the large circle of her admirers. Critics may find fault with the artistic merits of this production, may pronounce this scene unnatural, and that picture overdrawn, and yet the heart will respond to the truthfulness of her delineations. The author is much more at home in rural life than amid the artificialities of the city, where the heart, too, is either frozen by rigid conventionalisms, or spurns and tramples upon them at the sacrifice of truth and honor. Winthrop and Elizabeth, the principal heroes, illustrate not only some of the noblest of human virtues, but some of the most important duties of the Christian life and character. The story ends if not with a marriage, at least with an engagement, to which we presume young girls will think Winthrop came in altogether too calculating a manner. Yet his heart was in the right place at last, at least we hope they will think so.

THE DOUBLE WITNESS OF THE CHURCH. By the Rt. Rev. WM. INGRAHAM KIP, D. D. Seventh Edition. New York: T. N. Stanford. 1856.

We know of no work in defense of the Church, on the whole, so well adapted to general circulation as Bishop Kip's "Double Witness."

THE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY, revised and brought down to the present time. By W. P. STRICKLAND, D. D. With an Introduction by Rev. W. L. RICE, D. D., of Cincinnati. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 8vo. pp. 512. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

This large volume presents a full, and, we presume, reliable history of the American Bible Society from its establishment in 1816, down to the present time; its Officers, Constitution, operations, translations into upwards of *twenty* different languages, its distribution of the Bible into Canada, Mexico, South America, France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Austria, Sandwich Islands, China, India, Ceylon, Africa, the Levant, &c.; also its Agencies, Legacies, &c.; and, in an Appendix, portions from Speeches made in its behalf. The volume claims to have been written in a "Catholic" spirit; and yet the author on the first page of his history, says, "amid the surrounding darkness of Church and State, and the efforts to abridge ecclesiastical and civil liberty, the *Puritans*, with their open Bible, nobly contended for the faith, * * * they came to this land to make it the land of the Bible and of freedom; to worship God as revelation and conscience might teach." Now, what had all this to do with the "history"

of the American Bible Society, even if it were true! Why attempt, at the sacrifice of truth, to gain a sectional, partisan, narrow and contracted end! We see among its early founders and constant and most efficient supporters, down to this day, the names of many prominent Churchmen; while as an Institution it was anticipated by twelve years by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and also more or less in time, by at least twenty-four other European and Foreign Bible Societies. Although Churchmen believe it to be their bounden duty to send the living teacher and minister *with* the written Word, yet they can never feel otherwise than a deep interest in spreading that matchless Version which Churchmen first gave to the Anglo-Saxon race, and which they have done most to scatter among the nations.

MODERN GREECE: A Narrative of a Residence and Travels in that Country, with Observations on its Antiquities, Literature, Language, Politics and Religion. By HENRY M. BAIRD, M. A. Illustrated by about sixty engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1856. 12mo. pp. 380.

This work professes to be little more than a narrative of the author's observations during the single year which he spent in Greece, and mostly in Athens pursuing his studies, together with a brief description of celebrated places which he visited during this brief period. It is popular and sketchy rather than learned and philosophic. The thoughtful reader is left with a disheartening impression as to the prospects of religion, learning, and civilization among the Greeks, depressed by so many centuries of subjugation, and saddled, even now, with a Government which has no hold on popular confidence, but is regarded with deep-seated aversion.

The work is well worth reading for its descriptions of society, and of the present condition of the country, and of what is now being done for the elevation of the people of Modern Greece. Favorable mention is made of the labors of our own devoted Missionary, Mr. Hill. Mr. Baird thus describes the priesthood of the Greek Church:

"The ignorance and degradation of the clergy forms the gloomier aspect of the picture. Springing from the lowest class of society, they are notoriously illiterate and immoral. So deeply rooted has the notion of their debasement become in the popular mind, that when a boy is unruly, and his parents have failed in persuading him to learn some honest trade, they frequently consider the Church their last and only resource. This idea is embodied in the current proverb, which may be rendered into English by the couplet—

'Vicious and ignorant, gluttonous beast,—
Nothing remains but to make him a priest.'

But when the fact is known, that until lately there has been no provision for their education, beyond schools where they might learn to read and write, such a state of things will scarcely excite surprise."

HISTORY OF GREECE. By GEORGE GROTE, Esq. Vol. XII. Reprinted from the London edition. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 590.

Of all the Histories of Greece to which we have access, we give the palm to Grote. It is unquestionably better, more appreciative, more reliable, more truly philosophical, than Gillies', or Mitford's, or Thirlwall's. The author brings his narrative down to "the close of the generation cotemporary with Alexander—the epoch from whence dates not only the extinction of Grecian political freedom and self-action, but also the decay of productive genius, and the debasement of that consummate literary and rhetorical excellence which the Fourth Century B. C. had seen exhibited in Plato and Demosthenes." More than half of the present volume is devoted to the life and conquests of Alexander, when Greece proper could scarcely be said to exist, for her intellectual brightness was bedimmed, and her spirit broken.

Her speculative Philosophy still remained, however; and the two bright names which tower in grandeur as the loftiest intellects of ancient times, Plato and Aristotle, these will form the subject of a work yet to appear. This concluding volume of the History contains an excellent Map, and a complete Index to the whole work.

SERMONS ON THE PUBLIC MEANS OF GRACE; ON THE FASTS AND FESTIVALS OF THE CHURCH, SCRIPTURAL CHARACTERS, AND VARIOUS PRACTICAL SUBJECTS. By the late Rt. Rev. THEODORE DEHON, D. D. Bishop, &c., South Carolina. Second American Edition. With additional Sermons never before published. New York: T. N. Stanford. 1856. 8vo. 2 Vols. pp. 524, 535.

Mr. Stanford has done a good thing to publish a new edition of the excellent Sermons of Bishop Dehon; as the former edition was long since exhausted, and of three English editions not a single copy remains unsold. The Sermons, which are all short, are admirably adapted for reading in Churches where there is no minister, as well as for private instruction; for there is in them a soundness of doctrine, a cogency of argument, a fervor of devotion, a warmth and glow of emotion, and a chastened yet fervid eloquence of style well calculated to win the attention, instruct the mind, and captivate the heart.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, &c. 12mo. 1856. pp. 863.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, &c. 24mo. 1856. pp. 576.

Mr. Stanford, of the old New York Church Book-Store, has just issued editions of the Prayer-Book of the above sizes. The 12mo. edition is one of the most elegant books ever issued from the American press; the 24mo. is so compact as easily to be carried in the pocket or reticule.

THE CLERGYMAN'S COMPANION. By JOHN HENRY HOBART, D. D., late Bishop of New York, &c., &c. New York: Thomas N. Stanford. 1855. 12mo. pp. 128.

This is a new edition of a well known and most valuable Manual, more convenient to carry than the former edition; and more acceptable, as that was edited by one who went out from us because he was not of us.

THE OLD REGIME AND THE REVOLUTION. By ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE, of the Academie Francaise. Author of "Democracy in America." Translated by John Bonner. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 344.

M. De Tocqueville has been known as a political writer heretofore wholly by his work on Democracy, in which he showed great powers of observation and analysis; and he has now, after a silence of twenty-six years, come forward with a work so vigorous, so thoroughly cool and philosophical, so fresh in its delineations of the hidden current of the national life, that it must create a sensation. He gives a searching examination, not of the men, the actors, but of the real working of the institutions under the *old regime*, the relative position of various classes of society, the condition and feelings of those classes, the political maxims and philosophy which had taken possession of the people, in a word, those hidden causes which made the Revolution a matter of inevitable necessity. Nor is his work without its bearing upon the France of the present day. "I trust," says M. De Tocqueville, in his Preface, "that I have written this work without prejudice: but I cannot say I have written without feeling. It would be scarcely proper for a Frenchman to be calm when he speaks of his country and thinks of the times in which we live. I acknowledge, therefore, that in studying the society of the Old Regime in all its details, I have never lost sight of the society of our own day." The history of the French Revolution has often been written. The same elements which ripened into startling development there, a little sooner were germinating all over Europe; and the lesson which that Revolution taught, will not be forgotten for centuries to come. The work before us is worthy of its author, and will repay a careful study.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES. Letters to Ernst Moritz Arndt, on the Dangers to Religious Liberty in the present state of the World. By CHRISTIAN CHARLES JORIAS BUNSEN. Translated from the German by Susanna Winkworth. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 440. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

The freedom and boldness with which Chevalier Bunsen has mingled in the discussion of some of the most important theoretical and practical questions of the day, give to this volume an interest even beyond its own merits. The "Signs of the Times" which Chevalier Bunsen notes, are the development of the spirit of association on the one hand, and the evident increase of the power of the Clergy on the other; the aspirations of the nations after freedom of conscience, and the desire of the Clergy for the suppression of that freedom. The position which the author takes, is, that on the Continent of Europe, and especially in the German States, a strong and combined effort is now in operation on the part of the authorities of the Romish Church, in connection with the State, to repress the tendency to freedom of association and to trample upon the right of every National Church to govern itself. There is no doubt that all over Europe, and especially in Austria and Prussia, the Ultramontanists were never more busy than now; and yet in doing so, the Chevalier shows that Popery is violating old national compacts and rights, heretofore acknowledged to be sacred. He traces, incidentally, the same two opposing elements in Russia, France, Sweden, and elsewhere. The historical details and public documents which the author gives, pertaining to the Church in Prussia and Austria, if they detract somewhat from the popular interest of the work in the United States, do not detract from its value and importance. And it is noticeable that three large editions of this work were called for in Germany, within three months after its publication. Whatever may be the fact as to the Chevalier's orthodoxy, he is a sagacious man, and we are glad to see the rising indications that Prussia, England, and the United States, will join hand to hand on the battle ground against a political priestcraft and spiritual despotism, which must sooner or later come to an end. We wish we were equally confident that these three nations will agree as to those elementary principles of Christianity, without which freedom of conscience is only another name for popular infidelity. The moment the Chevalier begins to theorize and dogmatize, as, for example, in the latter part of the Tenth Letter, he shows his incompetency to grasp the great spiritual verities which condition the Church's freedom, life, and power. His German type of mind, and habit of thought, and fondness for religious speculation, spoil him for a religious teacher.

ROCKFORD PARISH: Or the Fortunes of Mr. Mason's Successors. By JOHN N. NORTON, A. M., Rector of Ascension Church, Frankfort, Ky. Author of "The Boy who was trained to be a Clergyman;" "Full proof of the Ministry," etc. New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 216. New Haven: Geo. B. Bassett & Co.

The secret of the success of Mr. Norton's books on the Church, lies in their unpretentiousness, and in the simple, straightforward style in which he narrates incidents in common life where the practical working of sound Church principles is developed. He does not give us learned quotations from the Fathers nor elaborate arguments to show that the English Reformers did hold to this, and did not hold to that; but he exhibits the Church at work, and as she appears in those every day occurrences of which life is made up. We have here the successors of Mr. Mason in Rockford Parish; first, there is the Rev. J. P:imrose Peterjohn; the man who had talent but did not have tact, who was a preacher but not a pastor; and whose stay in Rockford was very short. Then there is the Rev. Henry Dusenbury; "*Brother Dusenbury*," as the various preachers called him; who talked about the "*Sabbath School*," and straightened up his back at the name of Jesus in the Creed, and whose amalgamation tendencies made him plenty of trouble in the end. And next, is the Rev. Mr. Howard; a faithful, hardworking, sensible man. And then, besides other characters, there

is the Missionary Parish at Bedfordville, and a sketch of the thousand and one obstacles always to be overcome in such an undertaking, the prejudices to be outlived, and the open and underhanded assaults to be met. We have a suspicion that Mr. Norton has not drawn on his imagination for some of the materials of his story; here and there, we detect what, we doubt not, are the sober realities of real life. The book is sure to be useful; it is in that quiet, yet earnest, loyal tone, to which the heart of the Church is more and more responding as she is nerving herself up to her responsibilities.

PEEPS FROM A BELFRY. By REV. F. W. SHELTON. New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 304. New Haven: Geo. B. Bassett & Co.

THE RECTOR OF ST. BARDOLPH'S; or Superannuated. By the Author of "Salandar and the Dragon." New York: Dana & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 344. New Haven: Geo. B. Bassett & Co.

These are new editions of works of which we have already expressed our opinion, and which are widely known to our readers. Mr. Shelton is a fine classical scholar, his style is of the Addisonian cast, and he is one of our very best and purest writers.

REV. ADAM TOWNLEY'S SERMON, on "The Church the Channel of Personal Holiness." Paris, C. W.

Mr. Townley discusses two important questions: 1st, Wherein we come short of our position, and of those who lived in earlier days? and he answers: in the brevity and coldness of our public devotions; in the meanness of our public and private charities; and in our indifference to the spread of Christ's Kingdom. His next question is as to the cause of this degeneracy? And he finds that cause, in the "sad want in us of *that simple confidence* in the promises of JESUS EVER TO DWELL IN HIS CHURCH AND SEND HIS SPIRIT THROUGH HER ORDINANCES, which so preëminently marked the faith of the early Church; and to this infidelity of heart as respects Christ and the Comforter being in His Church, we do mainly attribute the want of holiness amongst ourselves. The early Church, and indeed our fathers, believed all these promises in their fullness and simplicity; they looked for Christ and His blessed Spirit in every institution and ordinance connected with His Church."

There is no one feature of Protestant Christendom in these days more marked, than in the tendency in some quarters, and the design in other quarters, to ignore the Church as a visible, positive, divine institution. Men talk about Christianity, not about Christ; about the Gospel, not about the Church. The early Continental Reformers used a language on this subject which now would be branded as Puseyism and what not; yet men, like John Wesley, said, "We believe there is and always was in every Christian Church (whether dependent on the Bishop of Rome or not) an outward priesthood, ordained by Jesus Christ, and an outward sacrifice offered therein, by men authorized to act as ambassadors of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God."

For ourselves, we believe the Church will never do her duty until her individuality and her prerogatives are asserted with Scriptural fidelity; and this will be done only in defiance of a philanthropic infidelity, and a false-hearted liberalism. Let her show her colors, and honor her profession by her works, and her reproach will cease.

It is a striking historical fact that *Church* radicalism inevitably leads to *Doctrinal* radicalism; and that loyal Churchmanship is the only surety-ship for the safety of Evangelical Truth. Thus the Unitarian Quarterly (Boston) for Nov., speaking of Mr. Jowett, says, and says with the greatest propriety: "If it is found that a few more men of equal weight can follow him in his thorough and candid dealings with the old bugbears of Scripture criticism, and can still remain in the English Church, we shall expect to see our own brotherhood broken up, as respects anything like a visible and distinct fellowship, by a virtual invitation extended to ministers and brethren to fall back into the Establishment."

BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW. Oct. 1856.

In this always most remarkable Periodical we find the following remarkable paragraph, which we commend to the attention of those beardless reformers among ourselves who walk in long garments, sneer at the English Reformers, and think all that is necessary to usher in the Millenium, is, to reintroduce the architecture, music, costume, and ceremonialism of the Middle Ages. Brownson says, "in proportion as we plunge deeper into mediæval society, and recover from that excessive admiration of everything mediæval which was the fashion a few years ago with a large class of English, French and German writers, the more defective do we find that society, and the less are we disposed to wish, even if it were possible, its reproduction."

And again, he says: "We should be loth to maintain that under every point of view Sicily and Naples, Spain and Portugal, Mexico and South America are superior in civilization to Great Britain and Holland, Sweden and the United States."

THREE YEARS ON THE KANSAS BORDER. By a Clergyman of the Episcopal Church. New York: Miller, Orton, & Mulligan. 1856. 12mo. pp. 240.

THE CONQUEST OF KANSAS BY MISSOURI AND HER ALLIES. A History of the troubles in Kansas from the passage of the Organic Act until the close of July, 1856. By WILLIAM PHILLIPS, special correspondent of the New York Tribune, for Kansas. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 414.

Amidst the whirlpool of excitement on Kansas our words would be unheeded. Besides, we are satisfied that the position of total abstinence from politics by the Church, *as such*, is a wise position. They who do not believe in the Church, and they who believe in her only to hate her, will of course scoff at her and her Ministers for the stand taken on this subject. These can afford to bide their time.

MEMOIRS OF CELEBRATED CHARACTERS. By ALPHONSE DE LAMARTINE, Author of "History of the Girondists," etc., etc. In three volumes. Vol. III. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin square. 1856. 12mo. pp. 323.

Lamartine is the most brilliant writer of the modern "French School;" and we have here portraits of five distinguished characters, William Tell, Madame de Sévigné, Milton, Autar, and Bossuet. Bossuet and Madame de Sévigné are drawn with much more truthfulness, elegance, and grace, than the radical old English Puritan, Milton, whom Lamartine fails to appreciate; for no Frenchman can do justice to a genuine Englishman.

HARPERS' SCHOOL HISTORY. Narrative of the general course of history from the earliest periods to the establishment of the American Constitution. With questions for the use of schools, with 150 maps and engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 450. New Haven: Durrrie & Peck.

This is a book by JACOB ABBOTT, is evidently prepared with great care, and deserves the attention of the teachers of Primary and Common Schools. Its important peculiarity is in the lucid order of the arrangement, and in the simple, concise, yet attractive language in which the leading events of History are narrated. The author begins at the earliest period, and comes down through the Assyrian, Persian, Grecian, Roman, and British Empires, to the organization of the American Republic and the establishment of the American Constitution. While it is not a universal history, it yet traces the line of events which leads to and is most connected with the history of our own country. It is equally well adapted to school and private libraries.

THE AMERICAN POULTEERER'S COMPANION. A Practical Treatise on the Breeding, Rearing, Fattening, and general Management of the various Species of Domestic Poultry. With Illustrations and Portraits of Fowls taken from Life, Poultry Houses,—Coops, Nests, Feeding-Hoppers, &c., &c., &c. A New Edition enlarged and improved. By C. K. BEMENT. With 150 Illustrations on wood and stone. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 304. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

To the great mass of Americans, running the maddened chase for gold, such an elaborately prepared book as this, with its numerous illustrations, will doubtless seem to be a funny affair. But Mr. Bement, the author, is full of his subject, and the reader is given to understand, at once, that that subject is not one to be trifled with. See how he describes what has already been done in the raising of poultry. "No one conversant with poultry can attend our markets without seeing evidences of great improvement. Many specimens show increased compactness, roundness, and symmetry, shorter leg, clean head and neck, fuller and closer feathers, etc.!" If the patrons of the turf do not find a new genus of the animal creation competing for popular admiration, it is not Mr. Bement's fault. But seriously, the book is a useful one; and the thousands of our citizens who, blessed with wealth and love of repose, are retiring to their country villas; and, still more, as a matter of "political economy," the multitudes who are engaged in this kind of traffic at the markets, will find this the very book for their use. Mr. Bement tells us that in New York about *two millions*, and in Boston about *one million* of dollars are expended annually for eggs. The poulterer will find the whole subject here illustrated, with a drawing of "Queen Victoria's Poultry-House," &c., &c., dissertations on the various species of domestic fowls, &c., &c., &c.

DRED: A TALE OF THE GREAT DISMAL SWAMP. By HARRIET BEECHER STOWE, author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin." Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 329, 370.

Perhaps we ought not to speak at all of this work, for we confess we have not read it through, though we sat down with that intent. But the work is too tedious for us. As a work of art its faults are glaring. The story has no beginning and no end. "Dred," or the character drawn under that name, is an unreality; no such character ever did live, or ever will. Its description of Southern Christians is a most gross caricature, conceived in ignorance or prejudice; and there is, throughout, an undercurrent of vulgarity and indelicacy which may possibly pass for genius among those whose morbid appetites crave such *pabulum*. What possible good such a work can do, either at the North or the South, we cannot imagine. Its only effect will be, to keep alive an irritated and mischievous state of feeling at home, and to present a most perverted view of the subject abroad. The book we see has a large sale, while works of standard worth are multiplying on the shelves of the book-stores.

It is a little funny that just as her book is in press Mrs. Stowe, and Mr. Stowe, hasten to England to receive again the greetings of English nobility and aristocracy, who imagine themselves thus administering a terrible rebuke on American slavery. But this time, Mrs. Stowe finds a rival. An English paper says, "The same ladies who, in a storm of indignation, would, with their scissors, cut the offending Jonathan into as many pieces as his flag has stars—the same gentlewomen courtesy low to Mirza Wallee Ahud Bahador, and admire the 'ladies' of his harem amazingly."

A CHILD'S HISTORY OF ROME. By JOHN BONNER. Uniform with "A Child's History of the United States," by the same Author. Richly illustrated. 2 vols. 16mo. Muslin. \$1.00. pp. 307, 311. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

Mr. Bonner has paid that regard to the critical rule of Prof. Niebuhr in respect to early Roman history which is justly due. That is, he has repeated

those fabulous stories which from the time of Livy have been received; but he has repeated them as legends, and not as veritable facts of history. He begins his "real History" of Rome with the times of Pyrrhus; and traces it down to the subversion of the Empire in the year 476, and the irruptions of the Goths, and the Vandals, and the Huns. Mr. Bonner does not profess to write as a learned and profound historian; his aim is to bring the History of Rome within the comprehension of children and to render it attractive to them; and that object he has accomplished. There is, however, a noticeable degree of pertness in all that he says, respecting the introduction of Christianity into Rome, and the characters of such persons as Constantine, and Julian the Apostate, who he says "was a very good Emperor;" and there is, also, throughout the work, a habit of wholesale and indiscriminate praise or censure, a cool and flippant infallibility on points where wise men are usually a little modest, which is the great fault of these popular little volumes.

THE SIGN OF THE CROSS; or, Edah Champlin. By LUCY ELLEN GUERNSEY. 12mo. pp. 309.

BREAD UPON THE WATERS. By MARY E. BRADLEY, with a note of introduction from COUSIN ALICE. 18mo. pp. 252.

SARAH BARRY'S HOME. A Sequel to the Christmas Gift. By JANE A. EAMES. 18mo. pp. 206.

THE JEWELS OF THE LORD, AND THE LORD OF THE JEWELS. 18mo. pp. 134.

These are all recent issues of the Sunday School Union and Church Book Society. They are very handsomely printed and illustrated, are attractively written, are sound and practical in their teaching, and will be sure to do good.

BISHOP WHITEHOUSE'S ANNUAL ADDRESS to the Convention of the Diocese of Illinois. Sept., 1856.

As we read the record of the Bishop's labors and official duties performed, and notice the rapid growth of the Church in Illinois, several new parishes having been admitted into union with the Diocese during the late Convention, and *twelve or fifteen* new churches being in course of erection, we cannot but hope for the speedy restoration of that mutual confidence and coöperation which, under God, alone are necessary to make the Church's position in Illinois a glorious one.

BISHOP DOANE'S TWENTY-FOURTH EPISCOPAL ADDRESS. Trinity Church, Newark, N. J. May 28, 1856.

The Bishop's earnestness, energy, and efficiency, are reflected in this annual record of official labors and Church progress.

HARPER'S STORY BOOKS. No. 23. THE ALCOVE. No. 24. DIALOGUES. No. 25. THE GREAT ELM.

This series of story-books will make a nice little present for the children. The works are uniformly moral, entertaining and instructive; are published monthly at three dollars a year; and the postage of each Number is two cents.

HYMNS FOR LITTLE CHILDREN. Twelfth Edition. 1856. London and New York.

MORAL SONGS. Sixth Edition. 1856. London and New York.

These are juvenile publications, by an English lady, published by Joseph Masters, London, and sold in New York by Dana & Co. The Author has the rare gift of a true poet, and knows how to write for the hearts of little children.

FOUR LETTERS TO A BAPTIST. By a Layman of Alabama. 1856. 12mo. pp. 36.

A good tract in defense of the Church, and is especially adapted for circulation among the numerous sect of Baptists.

THE REV. PROF. TREVETT'S ADDRESS before the Association of the Alumni of St. John's College, Annapolis, Md. Aug. 6, 1856.

REV. N. H. SCHENCK'S SERMON, on "Christian Moderation;" in Rosse Chapel, Harcourt Parish, Gambier, Ohio, Sept. 28, 1856.

We are glad to see such a Sermon from Gambier. - It is a strong announcement of a great principle lying at the foundation of any correct notions of Church comprehension and Christian Unity. Such views are silently but yet decidedly spreading in the Church, and will be hailed by all who are not imbued with the spirit of papal or puritan sectism.

REV. T. P. TYLER'S (of Batavia W. N. Y.) Sermon on "Elements of Success in Life," before the Rev. Mr. Everest's Rectory School, Hamden, Conn., July 6, 1856.

A most appropriate discourse, full of the deepest wisdom, before one of the best Schools in the country.

REV. WILLIAM F. MORGAN'S SERMON, "A Pleasant Child," in Christ Church, Norwich, Conn., on the death of Edward B. Chappell. An excellent discourse on the faults and duties of the times in respect to the government of children.

REV. DR. WILLIAM BACON STEVENS' SERMON, "Love is of God;" in Grace Church, Newton, Mass., August 17, 1856.

CATALOGUE OF THE OFFICERS AND STUDENTS OF YALE COLLEGE, 1856-57.

There are in this flourishing Institution 598 Students and 45 Instructors. The Students are divided as follows:

Law.....	30	Seniors.....	105
Medical.....	27	Juniors.....	105
Theological.....	23	Sophomores.....	128
Philosophy and Arts.....	46	Freshmen.....	134
	126		472
Total.....			598

PUBLICATION OF THE ASSOCIATE ALUMNI of the General Theological Seminary for 1856.

We have here the modest, sound and sensible Essay of the Rev. Dr. Hicks, on the "Origin, Nature and Limits of Ministerial Responsibility," an Essay well calculated to guide, quicken, and console Christ's Ministers; and a Sermon by the Rev. Dr. J. A. Spencer on the "Foolishness of preaching."

THE TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL REPORT of the Bishop White Prayer Book Society. Philadelphia. 1856.

This is one of the most noiseless, economical, and efficient of all our Church charities.

THE PASTOR PREPARING HIS FLOCK FOR CONFIRMATION, in Four Lectures; and also a Catechism on the Order of Confirmation. By the Rev. ALEXANDER WATSON, M. A., Curate of St. John's, Cheltenham. Adapted to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America. New York: Dana & Company, 381 Broadway. 1856. pp. 61.

In reprinting this English work in this country, much unnecessary matter has been left out, allowing the book to be sold at about one quarter of the price at which it was published in England. It has been also adapted to correspond with our Book of Common Prayer. The contents consist of Four Lectures, on the following subjects:—1, The obligations of the baptismal covenant; 2, The origin,

nature, and design of Confirmation; 3, The order of Confirmation in the book of Common Prayer; 4, the duty of the newly confirmed in reference to the Holy Communion. To these are appended a short Catechism, explanatory of the rite of Confirmation. This will be found a very convenient manual for the use of clergymen and others in preparing classes to assume in Confirmation, the obligations of their baptismal vows.

ARCTIC EXPLORATIONS; The Second Grinnell Expedition in Search of SIR JOHN FRANKLIN, 1853, '54, '55. Illustrated by upwards of three hundred engravings from sketches by the Author. By ELISHA KENT KANE, M. D., U. S. N. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 464, 466. 1856. Philadelphia: Childs & Peterson.

Previous to Dr. Kane's leaving Philadelphia, a public dinner was tendered him by a committee of gentlemen, among whom we find the names of the Rt. Rev. Bishop Potter, Hon. Richard Vaux, Mayor of the city, Hon. Horace Binney, &c., &c. The Royal Geographical Society of London, on his late arrival, welcomed him with appropriate marks of their high appreciation of his services to the cause of Science. It was moved by Sir Roderick Marchison, V. P. R. G. S., and seconded by Captain Sherard Osborn, R. N., F. R. G. S., and unanimously carried: "That, on the occasion of the arrival in this country of the eminent Arctic explorer, Dr. Kane, of the United States, for his arduous and skillful endeavors, under the auspices of Messrs. Grinnell and Peabody, to rescue Franklin, and the important additions he made to geographical knowledge, receive the gold medal of the Society; *Resolved*, that the president do communicate, on the part of the members, the expression of their sincere regret upon hearing that this distinguished man should have been prevented by ill health from appearing at the meeting, to receive the unanimous and hearty welcome which awaited him."

Such testimony, of itself, is proof that the work before us is one of which our whole country may be proud. It is not a record of scientific investigations; it is composed for the most part, of extracts from the journal of this heroic man; and gives with touching simplicity and becoming modesty, a narrative of startling discoveries, and of strange adventures, which, in thrilling interest, surpasses all the powers of romance. Of course, the great event of the expedition, and one which will immortalize the Author, was the discovery of the open Polar Sea. The existence of such a sea has now become an established fact; and our scientific Savans must give a solution of a mystery which seems to set at defiance our past inductions. The work is published elegantly. Paper, presswork, engravings, maps, &c., are all in admirable keeping with the design of the publication. The work will exert a prodigious humanizing power, though Peter Moneybags, Esq., will of course ask "to what purpose is this waste?" We hope the elegant volumes will be received in a manner worthy of a high-souled, noble-hearted, generous people, a people prompt to honor and reward such intrepid daring in so worthy a cause.

We have designed to do little more than announce the work now, and shall hope to do it more ample justice hereafter.

BEAUMARCHAIS AND HIS TIMES. Sketches of French Society in the Eighteenth Century, from unpublished Documents. By LOUIS DE LOMENIE. Translated by HENRY S. EDWARDS. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 460. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

This work on "Beaumarchais and his Times," is one of the most curious books of the day. He has hitherto been known as rather a clever dramatist, and the author of "The Barber of Seville." His name, too, figures incidentally in our own "Revolutionary Annals," as an early friend of the Colonies; although Pitkin, in his History, subjects his character to the serious imputation of playing a double game for mercenary ends, an imputation of which he was fully capable, but which, we think, is in this case unsustained. But the volume before us presents Beaumarchais in another aspect; as the very prince

of intriguers. He had a perfect passion for secret plots and cunning artifices. The missions on which he was sent, by Louis XV, to save the reputation of one who had none to lose, Madame du Barry; and by Louis XVI, on a similar end, for Marie Antoinette; and the manner in which he fulfilled his work prove him to have been as adroit as he was unscrupulous. His whole life was full of incidents, it was in itself a drama; although the tragic and the comic are perpetually intermingled. The work is a striking and sad picture of social life in France before the French Revolution, and shows the awfully corrupt state of public morals in high and low life. Such a state of society alone could have produced a Beaumarchais. We need not say then that the work has an intense interest beyond that of a personal biography, and for obvious reasons, almost as much so in this country as in France. The original French copy we have not seen, but the translation is in good and vigorous English.

ROME, CHRISTIAN AND PAPAL. Sketches of its Religious Monuments and Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, with Notices of the Jesuits and the Inquisition. By L. DE SANCTIS, D. D., formerly curate of the Magdelene, Professor of Theology in the Roman University, and Qualificator at the Inquisition. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 12mo. pp. 261. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

This is precisely such a work as we might suppose would be written by an imperfectly educated and honest man on his first deliverance from the Church of Rome. It shows how great a service Mr. Meyrick and his friends are doing in scattering on the continent reliable information concerning the English Reformation and the English Church. The Author was a Roman by birth, occupied the confessional fifteen years, was eight years Curate of a large parish in Rome, visited the Monasteries as preacher and confessor, was Professor of Theology, and qualificator of the Inquisition. Since he became a "convert to the Protestant faith, he has for some years past labored as a devoted minister of the Waldensian, or Primitive Italian Church at Turin, Sardinia. Within a few weeks he has been chosen professor in one of the Swiss Universities. His present work is in the form of "Letters," in which he describes supposed conferences between the *Abbe* a Romanist, *M. Manton* a Puseyite, and *Pasquali* a Waldensian. The soundest Church principles and the grossest Romish errors are associated together under the name of Puseyism; Pasquali converts both the Puseyite and the Papist, and so the matter ends. The work also describes some of the gross corruptions at Rome in the practical working of the Romish system. It is untrue to the English Church, but will be popular among the sects.

REPORT TO THE VESTRY OF TRINITY CHURCH, New York, on the state of the Parish. By WILLIAM BERRIAN, D. D., Rector of the same. 1856.

The Vestry of this Parish lately called by Resolution on the Rector and his Assistants for the information which we here find given. Old Trinity, instead of being a "rich sinecure for retired clergymen," is beginning to do her work and is doing it well. The Report shows a record of 1100 Communicants, 433 Baptisms, 176 persons confirmed, and \$16,431.84 given in charity. While, therefore, "Old Trinity" deserves all praise for what she has begun to do, it ought to be added, that there are single congregations in New York, each of which have given thousands of dollars in charity more than Trinity, with her four large congregations, and all their immense wealth.

LAKE NGAMI: Or, Explorations and Discoveries during Four Years' Wanderings in the Wilds of Southwestern Africa. By CHARLES JOHN ANDERSSON. With numerous Illustrations, representing sporting Adventures, Subjects of Natural History, Devices for Destroying Wild Animals, &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 521. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

This is a work of considerable interest, and adds somewhat to our knowledge of the Geography of South Western Africa. The Author's Wanderings were con-

hned mostly to the region of Walfisch Bay and the country of the Hottentots or Namaguas, between the Bay and Cape Town. His most important discovery was of a route from the South-west coast to Lake Ngami, a sheet of water about thirty miles in length and seven in breadth in latitude 20° South. He gives brief accounts of the German Rhenish Missionaries, Messrs. Hahn, Rath, and Kolbe, among the Damaras, whose labors thus far have not been very successful. The country is uninviting, and the inhabitants whom the author describes with particularity, are exceedingly degraded and vicious. Mr. Anderson's hunting exploits, and his description of the wild beasts of the country are narrated with spirit, and the whole work is handsomely illustrated.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS FROM SAINT AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE, Canterbury, England. Nine Numbers. 1856.

We are indebted to the Rev. A. P. Moor, Sub-Warden of this Missionary College, for these interesting papers. They contain letters from former members of the College, now scattered in distant parts of the world, recording their labors, trials, encouragements, &c., &c. One writes from Natal, another from Australia, another from New Brunswick, another from Canada, another from the West Indies, &c., &c. There are letters also from our own Dr. Cole at Nashotah, and from Mr. Breck among the Chippewas. One of these English Missionaries writes as follows:

"One of the things that strike me most in the religious aspect of India is the prevalence of Deism and Pantheism, which are in reality numbering more disciples than, it is probable, any other creed: the common villager you will constantly find holding these opinions. They are both to be met, as far as I can see, only by opposing the certainty of revealed truth to the uncertainty of human reasoning, especially upon matters so abstruse: the seed of these enormous systems has been education and advancement without Christian teaching. Western knowledge has alienated the mind from idolatry, but there has been nothing but Deism or the Pantheism of the Vedas to fill up the blank. The History of Pantheism would be a very useful study to our Indian students."

Another writes, "Without any hesitation I may observe that the greatest difficulty colonial clergymen have to sustain, is the virulent and unwearied opposition of dissent. Any amount of labor, mental or physical, one gladly undergoes in the establishment of truth; but the trial, requiring all one's faith, and patience, and endurance, is when one's work is unscrupulously attacked, and one's self coarsely and personally assailed, by men whose belief of the Christian faith is for the most part of a *negative* character. I may state that any looseness, or latitudinarianism, with respect either to the dogmatic articles of our faith, or the distinctive principles of the Church, is speedily corrected by a brief sojourn in the colonies. Men see here, with pain, the bitterness and unceasing hostility manifested by the sects against the Church; and this too is generally joined with most deplorable ignorance. Any attempt to conciliate is met with bitter opposition, unless accompanied by a renunciation of the principles of the Church, and an admission of unordained men to the *status* of ministers of God. And the feeling is, I grieve to say, not uncommon among Churchmen."

After all, Church principles, human nature, and sectarianism are unchanged in their nature, temper, and methods, the world over.

GREATORIX'S COLLECTION OF SACRED MUSIC. New York: T. N. Stanford. 1856.

This is a new edition of a work, which has been growing into favor since it was first published. It contains many compositions by its Author, which are unsurpassed for their sweet, flowing melodies, and chaste style. In the arrangements of the old tunes, those familiar with them as they have been used in this country will be surprised by new, sometimes strange harmonies, though the Author says in the preface, "That his aim has been to restore as nearly as practicable the old standard tunes and chants to their original harmonies." The large number of chants (more than one hundred) which the work contains, commends it to every Church choir. The organist of moderate ability will find in

the condensation of the parts upon two staves, an arrangement, which will render his task much less difficult, while at the same time, the singer will meet with no trouble from the greater number of characters, as the added parts are printed in small notes. The present edition has an Appendix consisting of Interludes in the different keys which will serve as models for the proper construction of these breathing points between the verses. The binding and typographical execution of the new work are in fine style, and give it an improved and attractive appearance. It deserves adoption into every Church Choir, and wherever a new book is needed, *this* is most cordially recommended.

ANDRE. A Tragedy in Five Acts. By W. W. LORD. New York: Charles Scribner 377 Broadway. 1856.

This work reached us too late for more than a brief notice. Without pretending to give a critical opinion on its dramatic merit we shall, for the present, only name some sources of interest which it seems to possess. Above all things, in this day of imitation and dilutions, we hail it as a serious and manly attempt to contribute somewhat to our legitimate national literature. It has taken for its subject by far the most interesting theme for dramatic effort in our American annals—a theme full of dignity and tenderness, historically grand and ideally suggestive, affording ample scope for the finest powers of tragic genius. The author handles it with evident enthusiasm and a thorough appreciation of its capabilities. The plot is simple and naturally evolved. The dramatic personæ, besides being happily individualized, are so managed as to make the reader feel that he is in the presence and amid the interests of living men. The style is grave and unambitious—free from sounding and brilliant claptrap, yet, where required, rising without effort to the noblest aspects of the theme. The action nowhere flags, but at every stage is characterized by vigor and directness. Altogether, we consider it a success in the most difficult branch of imaginative composition; and this is high praise.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS, IN GREEK AND ENGLISH, WITH AN ANALYSIS AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY. By SAMUEL H. TURNER, D. D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Interpretation of Scripture in the Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and of the Hebrew Language and Literature in Columbia College, N. Y., and Author of Commentaries on the Hebrews, Romans, and Ephesians. New York: Dana & Co., 381 Broadway. 1856. 8vo. p. 98.

In the last Number of the Review we noticed the commentary of Dr. Turner on the Ephesians, as in our view the most full and satisfactory of all his expositions of the Sacred Word. This exegesis of the Epistle to the Galatians is alike replete with the results of many years of profound and accomplished scholarship, and as we learn from the preface, was intended to be published in connection with that on the Ephesians. The delay was caused by a desire to examine a work then just announced, by Jowett, on the same Epistle. This, upon examination, is pronounced as in many respects quite meagre and indefinite, not to say of doubtful orthodoxy. This delay led to an acquaintance with another recent English production by Rev. Mr. Ellicott, which is highly commended as laying a solid foundation of safe interpretation in true grammatical principles, and gives the learned author occasion to express an opinion in his preface, which we venture to extract, and to commend to the consciences of all Christian teachers who embrace the classics within the range of their instructions—"An examination of this Commentary has served to confirm the opinion that the sound interpreter must also be the sound grammarian"—"may all our Academies and Colleges, which have in view the extension of Christian truth, and an acquaintance with the revealed documents which embody it, carefully, accurately, and thoroughly instruct their classes in that knowledge of Greek, which is the only solid human groundwork of New Testament interpretation." The Professors in our Theological Seminaries, who are brought in contact with the graduates of our Colleges and Universities, have, doubtless, learnt by vexa-

tious experience, that the want of thorough grammatic¹ training is likely to become a characteristic of American classical scholarship.

If we were to find fault with this Commentary, in any respect, it would be in this, that Dr. Turner, with a modesty rare among Biblical interpreters, does not more often give his own critical and decided opinion upon certain disputed passages, in favor of one among many interpretations. Thus, for example, on the meaning of the phrase, "Now a mediator is not of one, but God is one,"—(chap. iii, 20)—a verse, "which has given rise to more numerous and diversified interpretations than any other in the Bible," many prominent opinions advanced by learned expositors are introduced and accompanied by remarks, but leaving the general reader in the wealth of exposition, somewhat bewildered, and unable to decide which view is plausible, and which is not. We should, however, in justice to the Doctor, quote in his own words the principle adopted by him as a rule in such cases:—"I hold it to be a great and important principle in the exposition of Scripture, as it is also in the illustration of the divine volume of nature, to advance in opinion just so far as the accessible and clearly settled data allow; and, consequently, when these are not sufficiently full or clear to justify an explicit, unequivocal, and decided expression of the meaning, thus to confess a proper degree of ignorance and uncertainty. In the inquiring, thoughtful and judicious mind, unfounded assertion can never be made the substitute of satisfactory proof. It is better to acknowledge uncertainty than to decide with an air of positive and dogmatic infallibility. For this reason, I could not venture to express a decided opinion on some very difficult passages."

We refer briefly to two or three important portions of this Commentary, which will give a general idea of the author's style of exposition, and the thorough and searching analysis brought to bear upon the subject.

No little difficulty has arisen in explaining—"He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ," (chap iii, 16.) Many suppose that from the use of the singular number, the Apostle argues that the prophetic reference must be limited to one, and that the word "Christ" can only be understood of the Lord Jesus personally. Dr. Turner would translate the phrase "he saith" by the equivalent one "he means," and thus do away entirely with the idea that St. Paul intended to found any argument upon the use of the singular rather than the plural form. This rendering shows that the Apostle interpreted the promises to apply only to a particular one of the various classes of Abraham's descendants, that Christ is to be regarded here, not in his individuality, but in connection with his faithful body, ("Heirs according to the promise,") of which he is the head.

Directly following this we have presented at some length the different views of chronologists, upon the expression "four hundred and thirty years after," the time between the giving of the promise and of the law. This is given for the reader's information, the author not deeming the investigation of the subject necessary, in order to interpret the meaning of the Apostle.

The notes and explanations upon the last part of the 4th chapter, where the Apostle proceeds to give the allegorical bearing of certain facts in the life of Abraham, are very full and satisfactory. The translation of the sentence, "Which things are an allegory," the Dr. pronounces "loose and inaccurate," and denies that St. Paul ever represents the historical parts of the Old Testament as allegories.

In his view the facts referred to, are represented, in the same manner as parables, to convey religious instruction. "In a word, St. Paul regards Sarah and her son as prefigurative of the Christian Church and its spiritual members, while Hagar and Ishmael represent the Jewish community devoted to an external religion, which was characterized by elementary principles, mere rites and ceremonies of a fleshly nature. . . . As Hagar's offspring was born in a state of servitude, so the Jews were subjected to the ritual law. As Isaac, the son of the free woman, was himself free, so are Christians free from the Jewish yoke. And as the two children were born, the one according to nature, and in his be-

havior showed his natural character, and the other by virtue of the divine promise, so unbelieving Jews are in their natural sinful condition, and act accordingly, while true Christians are born of the Spirit, and persecuted by their blinded opponents."

We shall only add the hope that the life of the author may be long spared to instruct the Christian Church with his varied learning and his reverential and luminous exposition of the SACRED SCRIPTURES.

QUESTIONS ON THE SUNDAY EVENING LESSONS IN THE CHURCH SERVICE. By a LAYMAN of the Diocese of Connecticut. New York: Gen. Protestant Episcopal S. School Union and Church Book Society, No. 637 Broadway. 1857.

A superintendent of one of the largest Sunday Schools in New England is the modest "Layman of the Diocese of Connecticut," who writes this unpretentious little volume. It is therefore a working book, thoroughly practical, and carefully adapted to satisfy a want that every S. School Teacher has felt, in endeavoring to make plain and interesting, to inquisitive little ones, the "things hard to be understood" of Prophet and Apostle. In this view, it would prove an admirable Sunday Evening exercise for every Christian family. The author breaks new ground, as neither diffuse Jackson nor admirable Burgess nor any other writer we are cognizant of, has prepared questions on the Evening Lessons. Hence it will be of great service to more advanced classes, who are about to leave S. School because there is nothing more to study. The question is already interesting and suggestive, thus aiding both scholar and teacher. Add to these obvious considerations, the low price of the book, and we are sure it must be regarded as superior among the valuable little books that all find so useful in teaching a child "the way it shoud go."

HUMAN PHYSIOLOGY, STATICAL AND DYNAMICAL; OR THE CONDITIONS AND COURSE OF THE LIFE OF MAN. By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M. D., LL. D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York. Illustrated with nearly 300 Wood Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. 8vo. pp. 649.

The author of this work, by his previously published researches in chemistry and other departments of science, has acquired the character of a ripe scholar, an ingenious experimenter, a philosophical observer, and a logical reasoner. As remarked in the preface to this work, "The Science of Physiology is the result of the labors of thousands of the ablest men continued for centuries." A complete text book of the science must therefore be mainly a judicious compilation of these labors. Prof. Draper's book, however, is by no means a mere compilation. Much original observation and reasoning are exhibited throughout the work, which will of course be more liable to criticism than a work possessing less claims to originality. It is a learned and labored effort to extend the application of physical principles to the explanation of the phenomena of life. Perhaps the author may be regarded as enthusiastic in his expectation of a complete subjection of physiology to the domain of exact science. Most physiologists of the present day will hardly venture to expect a philosophical explanation, on strict physical principles, of all the influences and operations of what is termed the "vital principle," or of the "plastic power" of our author. This volume, however will be studied with interest by all who have a taste for an ingenious and profound investigation of the science of life.

The illustrations, many of which are new and well devised, are numerous, and much better executed than are found in most works of this class.

CONSTITUTION, &c., of the Alumni of the Theological Seminary at Alexandria, Va. 1856.

REGISTER OF THE COLLEGE OF ST. JAMES, Maryland. 1856.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT of the New England Female Medical College. Boston 1856.

Constitution, &c., of the Hartford (Conn.) Young Men's Association. 1856-57.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Barnwell, R. W.	Davis, .	Sept. 21,	Holy Cross, Stateburg, S. C.
Bringham, Geo. H.	Potter, A.	Sept. 26,	St. Philip's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Byllesby, Morrison,	Potter, A.	Sept. 14,	St. Paul's, Chester, Pa.
Carroll, Wm. H.	Potter, A.	Oct. 26,	Holy Trinity, Westchester, Pa.
Drumm, Thomas,	Potter, A.	Oct. 26,	Holy Trinity, Westchester, Pa.
Dudley, H. C. Hamilton,	Doane,	Oct. 26,	St. Paul's, Newark, N. J.
Ely, William,	Potter, A.	Oct. 6,	St. Luke's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Haven, John H.	Smith,	Oct. 26,	St. Paul's, Newport, Ky.
Hayward, Stephen G.	DeLancey,	Nov. 16,	St. Paul's, Syracuse, W. N. Y.
Hutchinson, Daniel F.	Lee, H. W.	Nov. 19,	St. Paul's, Durant, Iowa.
Latane, James,	Meade,	Sept. 19,	Christ, Millwood, Va.
McClure, Edward,	McCoskry,	Nov. 11,	Trinity, Marshall, Mich.
Phillips, H. L.	Davis,	Nov. 25,	St. Stephen's, Charleston, S. C.
Rogers, Silas M.	Potter, H.	Nov. 3,	Trinity, Plattsburg, N. Y.
Spofford, Henry A.	Potter, H.	July 6,	Zion, New York City.
Trivett, Robert C.	Potter, H.	Sept. 10,	Christ, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Woodruff, Curtis T.	Potter, H.	July 6,	Zion, New York City.
Winne, Frederick P.	Potter, H.	Oct. 31,	St. Paul's, Albany, N. Y.

PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. Barclay, C. C.	Whitehouse,	Dec. 7,	St. James', Chicago, Ill.
" Davis, Richard T.	Meade,	Sept. 19,	Christ, Millwood, Va.
" Ernst, John F.	Upfold,	Nov. 26,	Christ, Madison, Indiana.
" Johnson, Philip A.	Lee, H. W.	Sept. 7,	Trinity, Davenport, Iowa.
" Lanco, Lucien C.	Davis,	Nov. 25,	St. Stephen's, Charleston, S. C.
" Locke, DeWitt C.	Whitehouse,	Sept. 10,	Atonement, Chicago, Ill.
" Munroe, Wm. H.	Eastburn,	Sept. 25,	Messiah, Boston, Mass.
" Powers, H. N.	Potter, A.	Sept. 21,	St. James', Lancaster, Pa.
" Reese, Jr., Geo. B.	Potter, A.	Sept. 11,	St. Mark's, New Milford, Pa.
" Southgate, Wm. Scott,	Burgess,	Oct. 28,	St. Luke's, Portland, Me.
" Stickney, Geo. Waldo,	Cobbs,	Sept. 24,	St. John's, Montgomery, Ala.

CONSECRATIONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Brandon Church,	Johns,	Nov. 8,	Prince George, Va.
Calvary,	Potter, A.	Oct. 12,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Grace,	Whittingham,	Oct. 30,	Baltimore, Md.
Grace,	Kip,	Nov. 9,	Sacramento, Cal.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>ime.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Grace Chapel,	Doane,	Nov. 10,	Hoboken, N. J.
Holy Trinity,	Potter, H.	Sept. 23,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Mapleco Church,	Johns,	Nov. 7,	Charles City, Va.
St. Andrew's,	Williams,	Sept. 10,	Marbledale, Conn.
St. John Baptist,	Potter, H.	Dec. 2,	New York City.
St. John's,	DeLancey,	Sept. 18,	Mount Morris, W. N. Y.
St. Luke's Chapel,	Whittingham,	Aug. 26,	Bladensburg, Md.
St. Matthew's,	Davis,	Sept. 20,	Sumter District, S. C.
St. Paul's,	Lee, H. W.	Nov. 19,	Durant, Iowa.
St. Philip's,	Burgess,	Nov. 12,	Wiscasset, Maine.

OBITUARY.

DIED, at St. Andrew's Parsonage, Richmond, Staten Island, on Tuesday evening, Sept. 30th, Rev. David Moore, D. D., in the 70th year of his age.

In the death of this venerable man, a link of the chain connecting the present generation with the past has been sundered. Around his memory cluster many associations of by-gone days. Dr. Moore was the eldest son of the Rt. Rev. Channing Moore, late Bishop of the Diocese of Virginia. For 46 years he has ministered at the altar of St. Andrew's, succeeding his father, who for nearly 25 years was Rector of the same Church. Naturally robust and healthy, and of a very active and nervous temperament, he has ever faithfully performed the duties of his sacred office, and for many years no change could be observed except as his locks whitened with advancing age. For nearly half a century has he upheld the banner of the Cross, and exerted a wide influence for good. In his intercourse with his parishioners, his simplicity, his kind-heartedness, and the unaffected dignity of his deportment commanded and won the respect of all. No one could see him in their midst—his noble form with all the adornments, without the infirmities of age; his eye, beaming with the love and peace which dwell in his heart—without doing him involuntary homage. Well may we say of him, that he died, "full of years, and full of honors." After a long term of service, faithfully discharged, has he been taken from his flock and the community, to rest in the bosom of his God. Few men have lived who performed all the duties of the Christian pastor with such devotion and zeal; and never was one more beloved by the people entrusted to his care. Through snow and rain, sunshine and shade, by day or night, would he travel through his parish to administer to the spiritual wants of his flock; and his forgetfulness of self in his arduous duties has, doubtless, shortened his useful life. His funeral was attended at the Old Parish Church where the deceased and his father had ministered for 70 years, by a large concourse of people, the Clergy of the Island, and many of the Clergy of the city of New York,—Rev. Dr. Bedell preaching the sermon. Suitable resolutions of respect to his memory were passed by the Clergy present, and also by the Wardens and Vestry of St. Andrews', who directed that the Churches of which the deceased was Rector, St. Andrews', Richmond, and Trinity, Castleton, should be draped in mourning for one year.

DIED, in Worcester, Mass., on Tuesday, 4th of November, 1856, the Rev. NATHANIEL T. BENT.

Rev. Mr. Bent, at the time of his death, was the Principal of Herbert Hall, Worcester, where his talents caused him to be highly appreciated as a teacher. During the active years of his ministry, he was the popular and efficient Rector of several prominent churches in the Diocese of Massachusetts, and at one time was also Rector of St. John's Church, Bangor, Maine.

In accordance with his dying request, the Rev. Dr. Vinton, of Boston, and the Rev. Thomas R. Lambert, of Charlestown, officiated at his funeral.

DIED, on Monday, September 8th, at Cave Spring, Georgia, the Rev. WILLIAM McAULEY, aged 26 years.

The subject of this brief notice commenced his classical education in the London University, and resumed his studies after an interruption of a few years, in this country. He was admitted in December, 1855, as a candidate for Holy Orders in the Diocese of Western New York, under the Right Rev. Bishop DeLancey; but in consequence of the delicate state of his health, was transferred to Georgia, where he was ordained Deacon by the Right Rev. Bishop Elliott, 12th May, 1856, at St. James' Church, Marietta, Georgia. He was immediately called to take charge of the Church at Cave Spring, Floyd county, Georgia, but on account of his declining strength was unable to officiate.

In the midst of kind friends, and attended by the assiduous care of a devoted sister, he gently sunk into the arms of death, having the testimony of a good conscience, in the communion of the Catholic Church, in the confidence of a certain faith, in the comfort of a reasonable, religious and holy hope, in favor with his God, and in perfect charity with the world.

DIED, at Charleston, South Carolina, Sept. 11, 1856, the Rev. JOSEPH AUGUSTUS SHANKLIN, Rector of St. Peter's Church, aged 34 years.

Mr. S. was a native of Pendleton, South Carolina, and graduated at the Virginia University at the early age of 19 years, with the degree of Master of Arts. After receiving his degree he commenced the study of Law, and from his talents and industry, had every prospect of becoming distinguished in his profession. But about this time, returning to Pendleton, his attention was attracted to the Episcopal Church, his connections in boyhood having been with another religious body. After a careful examination, he formed a warm and enlightened attachment to the Liturgy, doctrine and Worship of the Church, and feeling himself called of God to preach the Gospel, he soon after became a candidate for Orders, and entered the Theological Seminary of Virginia. Having completed his course of study, Mr. Shanklin was admitted to the diaconate by the Right Rev. Bishop Elliott, of Georgia, in January, 1845, in Christ Church, Savannah, and was immediately appointed by the Bishop, missionary to St. Mary's, where he remained nearly two years. On the 15th of August, 1846, in the chapel attached to St. Luke's Church, Montpelier, Bishop Elliott ordained Mr. Shanklin to the priesthood. In January, 1847, Mr. S. took charge of Christ Church, Macon, Georgia, where he officiated till the fall of 1854, when he received and accepted a call to St. Peter's Church, Charleston. In addition to his pastoral labors, Mr. S. was at his decease, one of the editors of the Southern Episcopalian. In the October Number of this Periodical, we find a warm tribute to his fidelity as a pastor, and to his fortitude in exposure to the fearful pestilence which, in his death, deprived the Church of one of her most valuable ministers. This Periodical states that "Mr. Shanklin's funeral took place at St. Peter's Church, on Friday, September the 12th, at ten o'clock A.M. The church was hung in black; a very large congregation, including the Clergy of all the denominations in the city were present; the service was read by the Rev. C. P. Gadsden, and the remains were conveyed to their last resting place, in the rear of the church, by the Clergy of the Episcopal Church. Never have we seen a more affected congregation than was present. A deep solemnity reigned over all; and, while our tears flowed, we felt that it was not for him we wept, but 'for ourselves and our children.'"

DIED, in Beaufort, South Carolina, October 30th, the Rev. JULIUS W. STUART, Assistant Rector of Grace Church, Charleston.

Mr. Stuart had just commenced his career, as a minister of the Church, having been ordained Deacon, by Bishop Davis, the 22d of June, 1856. With the highest prospects of future usefulness it has pleased God to remove him, to the enjoyment of eternal felicity.

CHURCH STATISTICS OF THE SEVERAL DIOCESES.

DIOCESES.	BISHOPS.	EPISCOPAL ACTS.		ORDINA- TIONS.		Candidates.	Confirma- tions.
		Total No.	Clergy.	Deacons.	Priests.		
Maine.....	George Burgess.....	18	6	2	4	273	
New Hampshire..	Carlton Chase.....	14	3	1	1	132	
Vermont.....	John Henry Hopkins.....	20	1	2	2	239	
Massachusetts....	Manton Eastburn.....	77	9	6	9	960	
Rhode Island....	Thomas M. Clark.....	32	3	2	2	488	
Connecticut.....	{ Thomas Church Brownell. }	122	26	18	27	1,938	
	{ John Williams..... }						
New York.....	Horatio Potter.....	309	49	27	36	5,778	
Western N. Y....	William H. DeLancey.....	120	10	13	14	2,294	
New Jersey.....	George W. Doane.....	80	9	10	14	1,417	
Pennsylvania....	Alonzo Potter.....	161	21	18	28	3,242	
Delaware.....	Alfred Lee.....	19	3	1	3	279	
Maryland.....	William R. Whittingham.....	147	11	16	16	2,511	
Virginia.....	{ William Meade..... }	111	20	16	12	1,400	
	{ John Johns..... }						
North Carolina..	Thomas Atkinson.....	45	10	8	7	804	
South Carolina..	Thomas F. Davis.....	76	5	5	8	1,853	
Georgia.....	Stephen Elliott, Jr.....	22	2	2	5	577	
Florida.....	Francis H. Rutledge.....	7	2	1	210		
Alabama.....	Nicholas H. Cobbs.....	28	6	6	4	547	
Mississippi.....	William M. Green.....	31	4	5	4	491	
Louisiana.....	Leonidas Polk.....	32	1	4	3	559	
Texas.....	George W. Freeman.....	15	2	1	105		
Tennessee.....	James H. Otey.....	21	3	3	4	291	
Kentucky.....	Benjamin B. Smith.....	31	3	4	2	513	
Ohio.....	Charles P. Mellvaine.....	86	16	16	5	1,212	
Indiana.....	George Upfold.....	24	5	9	4	364	
Illinois.....	Henry J. Whitehouse.....	49	4	5	9	733	
Michigan.....	Samuel A. McCoskry.....	40	8	6	2	404	
Missouri.....	Cicero S. Hawks.....	23	5	4	3	320	
Wisconsin.....	Jackson Kemper.....	46	8	10	12	468	
Iowa.....	Henry W. Lee.....	20	1	4	3	132	
California.....	William Ingraham Kip.....	10	1			116	
		1830	254	227	243	30,650	
In 1853.....		1651	146	149	176	23,884	
In 1850.....		1558	221	228	120	18,937	

The above and following Tables are compiled from the Report of the Committee on the State of the Church, to the General Convention for 1855. Of course the official acts reported, are for three years. The only State of our Union, in which there is no organized Diocese, is Arkansas.

BISHOPS.—Besides the 33 here enumerated, are the Missionary Bishop of Oregon, the two Foreign Missionary Bishops, the returned Bishop Southgate, and the two Bishops Onderdonk, the latter of whom, since the remission of his sentence of suspension, is a Bishop without jurisdiction.

DIOCESES.	ABSTRACT OF DIOCESAN REPORTS.		SUNDAY SCHOOLS.		BAPTISMS.		
	Communicants.	Gain since 1853.	Teachers.	Scholars or Catechumens.	Infants.	Adults.	Total.
Maine	996	129	111	772	386	134	520
New Hampshire.....	581	4	42	358	165	40	205
Vermont.....	1,929	104			293	96	389
Massachusetts.....	6,027	418		4,850	2,504	286	2,790
Rhode Island.....	2,732	232	320	2,259	679	205	884
Connecticut.....	10,389	221	1075	6,107	2,721	697	3,418
New York.....	22,549	2,867	2202	19,113	12,398	1407	13,805
Western New York.....	9,226	1,126	932	5,505	3,768	870	4,638
New Jersey.....	4,332	762			2,304	399	2,703
Pennsylvania.....	12,816	216	1772	16,891	8,002	1016	9,018
Delaware.....	813	163	189	1,379	468	69	537
Maryland.....	9,686	1,526	374	3,600	6,043	621	6,664
Virginia.....	6,527	1,228	648	4,180	2,371	482	2,853
North Carolina.....	2,475	475		1,344	1,918	370	2,288
South Carolina.....	5,993	396	110	1,716	2,976	891	3,867
Georgia.....	1,736	616		1,499			1,047
Florida.....	615	105					
Alabama.....	1,461	430	120	1,000	1,206	275	1,481
Mississippi.....	1,037	465	97	673	1,112	409	1,521
Louisiana.....	1,421	301	65	1,287			2,373
Texas.....	500				288	45	283
Tennessee.....	862	92			564	119	683
Kentucky.....	1,465	303	181	1,881	900	192	1,092
Ohio.....	4,992	501	434	3,253	1,492	268	1,760
Indiana.....	1,058	212	134	834	520	136	656
Illinois.....	2,393	731			1,272	226	1,498
Michigan.....	1,962		163	1,039	914	196	1,110
Missouri.....	1,098	283	96	665	572	71	643
Wisconsin.....	1,172	29		1,351			1,192
Iowa.....	500	300					241
California.....	383	new.		409	350	22	372
	119,526	*14,390		81,465	56,136	9542	70,531
In 1853.....	105,136			62,376			48,157
In 1850.....	79,802			38,603			42,925

* Nett. † Not specified, 4853.

CLERGY.—If the Clergy in Minnesota, Arkansas, Kansas, Oregon and Washington, were added, we suppose the number would not be less than 1850.

CONFIRMATIONS.—The increase of numbers under this head is very remarkable. Yet if all those who have been confirmed had become Communicants, we should have had a gain of at least 20,000, instead of less than 15,000, under the latter head.

COMMUNICANTS.—Only two Dioceses report fewer communicants than they did three years ago; and this may arise from some defectiveness in the Reports made to the last Conventions of those Dioceses.

The summary under this head, for 1850, does not include the large Diocese of New York. With that it would probably have been nearly 95,000.

MISSIONS.

The Triennial Report of the Board to the General Convention gives the following summary for the three years last past:—

DOMESTIC.

Receipts:

Oct. 1, 1853, to Oct. 1, 1854,.....	\$38,404 15
Oct. 1, 1854, to Oct. 1, 1855,.....	42,107 60
Oct. 1, 1855, to Oct. 1, 1856,.....	47,245 17
	<hr/> \$127,756 92
In previous three years,.....	85,837 45
	<hr/>
Increase,.....	\$41,919 47

Payments:—

Oct. 1, 1853, to Oct. 1, 1854,.....	\$40,037 85
Oct. 1, 1854, to Oct. 1, 1855,.....	42,892 73
Oct. 1, 1855, to Oct. 1, 1856,.....	51,917 15
	<hr/> \$134,847 73
In previous three years,.....	85,719 40
	<hr/>
Increase,.....	\$49,128 33

FOREIGN.

Receipts:

June 15, 1853, to June 15, 1854,.....	\$59,582 23
June 15, 1854, to Oct. 1, 1855,.....	71,480 27
Oct. 1, 1855, to Oct. 1, 1856,.....	69,701 58
	<hr/> \$200,764 08
In previous three years,.....	126,501 06
	<hr/>
Increase,.....	\$74,263 02

Payments:—

June 15, 1853, to June 15, 1854,.....	\$57,292 10
June 15, 1854, to Oct. 1, 1855,.....	76,226 71
Oct. 1, 1855, to Oct. 1, 1856,.....	69,761 21
	<hr/> \$203,280 02
In previous three years,.....	127,781 08
	<hr/>
Increase,.....	\$75,498 94

As to Missionaries they report:—

DOMESTIC.

In October, 1854,—108 stations, 90 Missionaries.
 In October, 1855,—122 stations, 102 Missionaries.
 In October, 1856,—144 stations, 126 Missionaries.

FOREIGN.

In Africa, China, and Greece,	
Missionaries,.....	20
Assistants,.....	20
Native Teachers,.....	12
Pupils,.....	1413

